DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 952 FL 011 930

AUTHOR Nieves-Squires, Sarah; And Others
TITLE Feasibility and Credibility of Bilingual Instructional Features Study Plans: Field Verification. Planning Paper 5. Bilingual Instructional Features Planning Study.
INSTITUTION Abt Associates, Inc., Cambridge, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. National Council on Educational Research.
REPORT NO AAI-80-19
PUB DATE 1 Mar 80
CONTRACT 400-79-0071
NOTE 94p.: For related documents, see FL 011 926-929.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Bilingual Education; Credibility; *Educational Planning; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Feasibility Studies; *Instructional Development; Interviews; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS National Institute of Education

ABSTRACT

This report is one of five submitted as products of a "Study Designed to Assist Planning of Research on Significant Instructional Features in Bilingual Education Programs." The reports are intended to assist the National Institute of Education in its plans for a major new research study in bilingual education. The present report summarizes the results of 123 open interviews conducted with bilingual practitioners who are administrators in: Los Angeles, California; Miami, Florida; New York, New York; Oakland, California; and Rough Rock, Arizona. The questions asked were designed to elicit responses about the working definitions of terms and the designs considered. The intent was to test the credibility and acceptability to consumers of alternative study approaches. Among important concerns to emerge from the interviews are respect for administrative protocol of each educational organization, the need for a clear prospectus of the study, financial burden and disruption of educational process, clarification of benefits of the study, and the need to secure parental cooperation. (Author/JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED193952

ABT ASSOCIATES INC.
55 WHEELER STREET, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02138
TELEPHONE • AREA 617-492-7100
TWX: 710-3201382

AAI Report #80-19

BILINGUAL INSTRUCTIONAL FEATURES PLANNING STUDY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Planning Paper 5

Feasibility and Credibility of Bilingual Instructional Features Study Plans: Field Verification

by

Sarah Nieves-Squires
Robert L. Goodrich
Cristina Bodinger-de Uriarte

March 1, 1980

Contract No. NIE-400-79-0071
Study Designed to Assist Planning of Research on Significant Instructional Features in Bilingual Education Programs: Task 5 Report

Robert L. Goodrich, Project Director
Sarah Nieves-Squires, Deputy Project Director

Mae Chu-Chang, Project Officer

Prepared for:
The National Institute of Education
1200 19th St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20208

Contract Manager	Quality Control Reviewer	Management Reviewer

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

2 SEP 2 1980

FL011430

FOREWORD

This report is one of five submitted by Abt Associates Incorporated (AAI) to the National Institute of Education, as products of a "Study Designed to Assist Planning of Research on Significant Instructional Features in Bilingual Education Programs", Contract No. NIE-400-79-0071. The reports are intended to assist NIE in its plans for a major new research study in bilingual education. The information provided will be combined with that from other sources by NIE in its construction of a research plan, to be incorporated in one or more requests for proposals (RFP's) to implement and conduct the major study.

The Instructional Features Study was formulated by the Division of Education Part C Coordinating Committee as one of several studies that implement research mandates in the language of ESEA Title VII, Part C. A description of the study (denoted "B-1") is provided in the U.S.H.E.W. Research Plan for Bilingual Education (July, 1979). This planning assistance study was one component of Phase I of the Three phase HEW plan.

These reports were prepared as products of Tasks 1-5 of the planning assistance contract. The titles of the reports, and summaries of their contents, are:

1. Working Definitions of Terms for the Bilingual Instructional Features Study, by Sarah Nieves-Squires and Robert L. Goodrich.

   This is a discussion of working definitions of terms for use in the features study. The terms discussed are "bilingual education", "consequences for children", "instructional features", "significant", and "model". Alternative definitions and the implications of each for design are presented. The definitions selected by NIE are intended to guide the research to be conducted.

2. A Bibliography of Significant Instructional Features in Bilingual Education Programs, by Sarah Nieves-Squires, et al.

   This is an annotated bibliography of papers, articles, pamphlets and books that deal with instructional features of bilingual education. The materials are organized by a classification system of features based on a content analysis of the sources surveyed. The report demonstrates that, while many instructional features are discussed, there is little or no empirically based research on their specific consequences for children.

3. Planning Factors for Studies of Bilingual Instructional Features, by Robert L. Goodrich.

   This report is based on a review of studies of educational instructional features in both monolingual and bilingual contexts, and on conversations with a large number of researchers and critics. The intent of the report is to summarize the state of the art of bilingual educational features research as a base for designs to be developed by NIE.

4. Tentative Alternative Designs for a Study of Significant Instructional Features in Bilingual Education, by Robert L. Goodrich.

   This report presents alternative study designs and plans for implementation of the instructional features study. It is based on the knowledge base assembled in the three preceding reports. The designs presented are not to be implemented directly by NIE in the RFP, but used. Rather, they are simply one source of information available to the NIE planners, to be factored into the overall design process.

5. Feasibility and Credibility of Bilingual Instructional Features Study Plans: Field Verification, by Sarah Nieves-Squires, Robert L. Goodrich, and Cristina Bodinger-de Uriarte.

   This report summarizes the results of 123 open interviews conducted with bilingual practitioners and administrators in five sites: Los Angeles, Miami, New York, Oakland, Rough Rock, AZ. The questions asked were designed to elicit responses about the working definitions of terms (Paper 1) and the designs considered (Papers 3, 4). The intent was to test the credibility and acceptability to consumers of alternative study approaches.

Table of Contents

		Page
1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
2.0	DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FIELD VERIFICATION	3
3.0	FIELD VERIFICATION FINDINGS	10
3.1	Definitions of Terms in Bilingual Education--Synthesis of Responses	10
3.1.1	Responses From SEA and LEA Administrators	10
3.1.2	Responses From Teachers and Principals	12
3.1.3	Responses From Teacher Aides, Community Representatives and Parents	16
3.1.4	Responses From Bilingual Education Representatives	18
3.2	Research Approaches - Syntheses of Responses	20
3.2.1	Responses From SEA and LEA Administrators	20
3.2.2	Responses From Teachers and Principals	21
3.2.3	Responses From Teacher Aides, Community Representatives and Parents	24
3.2.4	Responses From Bilingual Education Representatives	27
3.3	Measurement and Observations - Syntheses of Responses	28
3.3.1	Responses From SEA and LEA Administrators	28
3.3.2	Responses From Teachers and Principals	30
3.3.3	Responses From Bilingual Education Representatives	33
3.4	Data Available in School Files	35
3.5	Permissions and Support for the Study	38
3.5.1	Dade County	38
3.5.2	Los Angeles	40
3.5.3	New York City	42
3.5.4	Oakland	44
3.5.5	Rough Rock	46

	Page
4.0 IMPLICATIONS FOR THE STUDY	49
4.1 Definitions of Terms in Bilingual Education	49
4.1.1 Bilingual Education	49
4.1.2 Consequences for Students	51
4.1.3 Significant Instructional Features	53
4.1.4 Instructional Models	54
4.2 Sample Design	55
4.3 Data Collection	61
4.4 Suggested Approach to LEAs and Schools	62
4.5 Implications for Identification of On-Site Staff	63
APPENDIX I: DADE COUNTY FIELD VERIFICATION REPORT	65
APPENDIX II: NEW YORK CITY FIELD VERIFICATION REPORT	70
APPENDIX III: OAKLAND FIELD VERIFICATION REPORT	84

1. INTRODUCTION

This report is the fifth of a series to be prepared by Abt Associates Inc. for the National Institute of Education (NIE) as part of a "Study Designed to Assist Planning of Research on Significant Instructional Features in Bilingual Education Programs." The goal of this planning assistance study is to produce alternative designs and recommendations for the coming Instructional Features Study, which is part of the research authorized by Congress in the Bilingual Education Act, Part C. NIE will integrate these plans and recommendations into its own planning process and, when this process is complete, will issue requests for proposals (RFP's) for the implementation of the study or studies to be conducted. This report is addressed to NIE and other institutions, corporations or individuals who are involved, or may become involved, with the Instructional Features Study. Knowledge of the HEW Bilingual Education Research Plan, the RFP for the present planning study and previous reports in this series is assumed.

The previous four reports (Planning Papers 1-4) have the following titles, each of which describes a task performed in the planning assistance study: (1) Working Definitions of Terms for the Bilingual Instructional Features Study; (2) A Bibliography of Significant Instructional Features in Bilingual Education Programs; (3) Planning Factors for Studies of Bilingual Instructional Features; and (4) Tentative Alternative Designs for a Study of Significant Instructional Features in Bilingual Education. The first three reports are intended to consolidate, in a convenient form, the existing knowledge on which to base study designs. The fourth presents tentative designs following from the knowledge base.

The purpose of this fifth report is to "assess the feasibility, credibility and other considerations of the study plans through a 'field verification' process." The results of this field verification process are intended to assist NIE to assure the realism and appropriateness of the study design as it will finally appear in the instructional features study RFP.

Previous reports in this series took into account the opinions of many researchers, however there was little substantive input from bilingual education practitioners. This report focuses on such input almost entirely.

The field verification effort was conducted in five sites (New York City; Miami; Rough Rock, AZ; Los Angeles; and Oakland, CA) selected from the language/geographical area strata recommended for the instructional features study. In each site a variety of respondents (SEA personnel, LEA personnel, school personnel, community people and parents) were interviewed following protocols that guided the interviews towards specific objectives. Most of the 123 interviews were conducted by five on-site teams familiar with the community and the school systems involved. Each site was also visited by AAI staff who interviewed selected respondents from LEA's and SEA's and guided the work of the on-site teams. The entire field effort was concentrated in a two-week period in February, 1980.

This report is organized as follows:

First, the design and implementation of the field verification are presented and related to five specific objectives.

Second, syntheses of the responses are presented, organized by objective and by site or respondent group. These syntheses capture the essence of what was communicated in the 123 interviews, omitting superfluous detail, and expressing the ideas in more uniform vocabulary.

Third, some of the implications of the findings for the design of the instructional features study are presented.

Fourth, three reports prepared by on-site teams in New York, Dade County, and Oakland are presented in appendix.

Readers of this report should understand that it is not a polished, well-edited document but simply an account of a process and its findings, prepared to make these findings available immediately. The exigencies of the NIE planning schedule made timeliness more important than polish. Although we might have prefered to integrate and develop conclusions more fully, the basic information is here. We hope that it will be useful.

2. Design and Implementation of the Field Verification

The primary motive of the field verification was to assure the feasibility and credibility of the Instructional Features Study plan in the real world of bilingual education. The ideal way to do this would involve classroom observations, active tryout of instruments and techniques, and other "hands-on" procedures intended to test research-oriented notions in the real world. This was impossible for two reasons. First, AAI personnel do not know the actual plans that NIE is evolving--this planning assistance study is only one of the influences in the design. Second, there were not sufficient time or resources to conduct such a study. Therefore, the field verification effort depended on extensive interviewing rather than on observations or direct tryouts.

Such observations and tryouts will, however, be conducted later in this study in a limited way. Videotapes will be recorded in a sample of classrooms in two sites to be selected. These tapes will be used, together with those available from other studies, as a resource in specifying observation instruments more fully. The feasibility of the study designs proposed to NIE does not directly depend on this further field effort. The effort will be part of Task 6 of this planning assistance contract, "to develop final recommendations for the study design."

The objectives that guided this field verification effort are as follows:

1. To verify the credibility and acceptability of the working definitions;
2. To verify the tentative design approach of the instructional features study set forth in Planning Paper 4;
3. To survey the feasibility of collecting data through interviews, classroom observations, questionnaires, tests, and informal investigation;
4. To survey the availability of data in local school files, and the organization formats of these data;
5. To determine the procedures and specific legal requirements for obtaining permissions for the study, and
6. To determine how best to elicit support and cooperation from the community, the Local Education Agency, parents, school administration, teachers and teacher aides.

These objectives were used in drawing up a long master list of specific questions that addressed aspects of each objective. The list was drawn up without regard to who might or might not have the information. The respondent groups were selected to present a broad range of roles inside and outside schools and at all levels of the educational hierarchy. These groups were identified as follows:

1. SEA and LEA (District Office) administrators, preferably to include the highest person directly involved with bilingual education at state level, as well as representatives of the Board of Education.
2. Principals, teachers, representatives of bilingual education, and the district-level research and evaluation office director.
3. Teacher aides, community representatives, and parents.

These groups were broken out by their apparent access to information. The questions on the master list were then assigned to respondent groups on the basis of whether they were likely to have the necessary knowledge. The resulting lists of questions were tested in-house and reduced substantially in length. Questions were also revised according to recommendations by field staff who were to conduct the interviews. There was not time for fullscale field test of interview protocols, however.

Sites for the field verification were chosen from the eight language/geographical strata presented in Planning Paper 4 (pp. 30-32). These are as follows:

Language/Geographical Strata

(1) Spanish (West/Southwest)
(2) Spanish (Northeast)
(3) Spanish (Southeast)
(4) Spanish (Midwest)
(5) Navajo
(6) Chinese
(7) French (or other European language)
(8) Vietnamese, Filipino, or Korean

It would have been desirable to include one site from each of these strata, but this was not possible within the economic and time resources available. Therefore only five strata were represented in the field verification.

Strata and the relative selected sites follow:

Field Verification Sites

(1) Spanish (West/Southwest)	East Los Angeles
(2) Spanish (Southeast)	Dade County, FL
(3) Spanish (Northeast)	East Harlem (District 4), NY
(4) Navajo	Rough Rock, AZ
(5) Chinese	Oakland, CA

The interviewing teams for each site are identified in Table 1. Tables 2 through 7 list respondents by category. The anonymity of respondents has been maintained, with the exception of a few in higher level positions.

Table 1

Interviewers by Site

Oakland, CA	Rodger Lum*
	Wayne Luk
	Esther Wong
Los Angeles, CA	Ray Perez*
	Lasse T. Tiihonen
	Jose Da Silva Goncalves
Rough Rock, AZ	Marc Mannes*
	Mark Sorensen
	Daisy Kiyaani
Miami, FL	Felicia Gil*
New York, NY	S.B. Cervenka*
	Jill Rips
	Carmen Perez Delgado

*Principal Investigator

Table 2

Total Number of Respondents

Dade County	29
Los Angeles	16
New York	24
Oakland	25
Rough Rock	28
National Figures	1
TOTAL:	123

Table 3

Respondents in Dade County

1	SEA Bilingual Education Consultant
1	LEA BE Program Director
3	Principals
9	Teachers
9	Teacher aides
1	BE Representative (BE Education Coordinator and Member of Research and Evaluation Committee)
5	Community Representatives
29	TOTAL

Table 4

Respondents in Los Angeles

1	District Assistant Superintendent
1	Coordinator, Asian Languages Program
4	Principals
5	Elementary Teachers
1	Parents
4	Teacher Aides
16	TOTAL

Table 5

Respondents in New York City

LEA Administrators

1 LEA Bilingual Program Director

1 District Superintendent

BE Administrators

1 District Director of Bilingual Programs

2 Project Directors (JHS)

1 Project Director (Elem.)

1 Program Coordinator (Elem.)

1 Program Director (Elem.)

Principals

3 Elementary Principals

2 High School Principals

Teacher Aides, Community Representatives

1 TA/President of PAC/Parent

3 Other Community Representatives

Teachers

6 Elementary

2 JHS

2 HS (1 vocational)

Teacher Aides

5 Elementary

2 JHS

24 TOTAL

Table 6

Respondents in Oakland

1 LEA Bilingual Program Director

5 Principals

9 Teachers

5 Teacher Aides

5 Parents

25 TOTAL

Table 7

Respondents in Rough Rock

2	LEA Program Directors
1	Federal Program Administrator
1	Curriculum Director
14	Teachers and Principals
6	Teacher Aides
4	Community Representatives
28	TOTAL

National Figures

President of National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE)

In addition to the protocol-guided interviews, a group meeting was held between AAI personnel, Ray Perez, and representatives of the Los Angeles Unified School District, on February 15, 1980. Attendees were as follows:

Barbara Gutierrez	Coordinator Title I Schools
Ramiro Garcia	Asst. Director, Elem. Bilingual-ESL Services Branch
Janet Iwasaki	Coordinator, Asian Languages Programs
Mirta Gonzales Feinberg	ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education Coordinator
Sally Coughlin	Law Specialist
Bob Rangel	Asst. Supt. Bilingual ESL Services Branch

This meeting was taped and used to inform the discussions presented in Sections 3 and 4.

Approximately 125 interview records were collected, each involving over one hour of the respondent's time. About two-thirds of the questions were open-ended and about one-third categorical. Open-ended responses for each question were content-analyzed and a list of response categories was prepared. Then a tally of responses to all questions was made and used to prepare prose syntheses of the responses to each question. These syntheses provided the data on which this report was directly based. These are provided in the next section.

3. FIELD VERIFICATION FINDINGS

This section provides a summary of conclusions synthesized from 123 separate interviews. Questions asked during the interviews were organized according to the objectives of the field verification listed in Section 2. These were as follows:

1) Verify working definitions of terms from Planning Paper 1;

2) Verify the design approach set forth in Planning Papers 3 and 4;

3) Survey feasibility of collecting new data via observations, questionnaires, interviews, and tests;

4) Survey availability and usefulness of data existing in local files; and

5) Determine likely levels of support for the study and the best means to secure necessary cooperation.

Examination of the raw data showed that responses to questions addressing the first three objectives tended to be uniform across sites but to differ across major respondent groups. Therefore, these data were synthesized across sites, but separately for different respondent groups. The first three subsections of this section present these syntheses by objective and further divided by respondent group. Any significant site differences are noted.

The fourth subsection presents information about objective 4 (available data) synthesized from all available interviews.

It was determined that responses to questions under the fifth objective (permissions and cooperation) varied primarily by site rather than by respondent group. The fifth subsection, therefore, presents syntheses across respondents by site.

3.1 Definitions of Terms in Bilingual Education--Synthesis of Responses

3.1.1 Responses from SEA and LEA Administrators

1) The common theme of all definitions of bilingual education was the use of the home language as the medium of instruction. Respondents offered a variety of additional comments about transitional, cultural, and maintenance approaches to bilingual education. Respondents in Oakland

cited that the purpose of the use of L_1 in content instruction was to facilitate academic progress.

2) The following features of bilingual education were judged significant by at least one respondent:

Use of languages
ESL
Bilingual teachers
Staff qualifications
Teaching content in student's dominant language

3) An instructional model is seen as a structure for teaching, including the following elements: time and frequency of use of each language, by content area; staffing patterns; and curriculum. One respondent (Dade) mentioned the need for individualization.

Most respondents thought that bilingual education and mainstream instructional models should differ, especially in the use of two languages. Two respondents (New York, Oakland) felt that bilingual education and mainstream education should not differ.

LEA administrators felt that models helped to organize, plan and evaluate teaching. One cited that an external planner can use a model as a tool for program implementation, in a reasonably uniform way. The model serves as a framework for program improvement and successful programs may be replicated.

Most respondents did not wish to explain the relationship between models and instructional features. Those who did explained that the model incorporates instructional features in well defined ways.

4) Except in Rough Rock, administrators thought that bilingual education should be open to all who are interested, but especially for LEP/NEP students. In Rough Rock, respondents felt that bilingual education should be open to language minority students.

All respondents thought that bilingual education should extend at least from preschool through high school. Some felt that it should extend further, into adult and post-secondary education.

5) Some of the objectives for bilingual education that were cited are:

Academic success
Cognitive development
Bilingualism
Biculturalism
Cultural and linguistic maintenance
Improved self-concept

6) The consequences for students that were mentioned are as follows:

Bilingualism
Improved self-concept/self-awareness
Cultural pride
Biculturalism
Parental involvement
Academic performance
Economic success
Improved social relations
Improved motivation

No negative consequences were cited.

The following community consequences were seen:

Community participation/involvement
Economic progress
Parental concern

Rough Rock respondents stated that bilingual education helps the community to value its own language.

3.1.2 Responses from Teachers and Principals

1) The common element in defining bilingual education across sites and respondents was simply the use of two languages in instruction. Nearly every definition went on to cite bicultural content of the program and maintenance of the home language and culture. Many cited the use of L_1 to teach L_2, the use of L_1 to teach content, and ESL as particular features in bilingual education.

2) The instructional features most emphasized were ESL, maintenance, and teacher qualifications. Each of the following features listed was regarded as significant by at least one respondent.

Materials

Tests
Audiovisual
Crosscultural
In native language
Pertinence of
Videotape

Curriculum

Maintenance
In two languages
For NES/LES
In language arts
Congruent with needs
With multiethnic content

Teachers

Qualifications
Commitment
Certification in L_1
Bilingualism
Acceptance of children
Awareness of objectives
Awareness of community
As role models
L_1 competence
Inservice training

Teacher Aides

Bilingualism
Used as translators
L_1 competence
Inservice training

Languages

Use of L_1
Use of L_1 as resource
Use of L_1 to teach content
Teaching new material in L_1
Teaching familiar material in L_2
Use of dialectal varieties
Child's use of L_1, L_2 in community
Early education in L_1
Basic skills in L_1, L_2
Coordination of L_1, L_2 objectives
ESL
ESL for immigrants
Language arts in two languages
Time spent in L_1, L_2

Teaching Methodology/Evaluation

Testing
Modeling
Peer tutoring
Pullout
Volunteer tutoring
Attention to learning styles

Community

Involvement
Resources outside
Parent involvement

Attitudes

Children towards L_2
Teacher
Principal
Emphasis on self image of students
Administrative support
Reliable funding

Organization

Group size
One-to-one practice
Pullout

3) The common element present in definitions of an instructional model was that it provides a guide or pattern for teaching. Ideally, a model is proven successful, replicable, implementable, and specific in its objectives. It specifies organization, curriculum, materials, strategies, time allocation, and content by language.

Most respondents felt that bilingual instructional models differ from mainstream models. Elements that were thought to differ include: 1) using two languages in instructional; 2) including cultural component; 3) emphasizing maintenance of the home language and culture; 4) adapting instruction to the student and to the community; 5) relating instruction to the native culture; 6) cultural sensitivity and awareness; 7) using materials in L_1; 8) greater supportiveness; 9) transitional approaches; 10) presenting Anglo ideas in L_1; and 11) promoting positive cultural images.

According to respondents, the primary purpose of a model is to provide a guideline to teachers and educators for the implementation of the basic goals

and objectives of the program. A model is useful for efficient achievement of program goals. It may be used to transfer successful programs to a new site and to obtain consistency in program implementation. Some respondents were opposed to the use of models in these ways, however. They felt that classrooms were sufficiently distinct from one another to necessitate each classroom evolving its own teaching patterns.

Instructional features were considered by most to be components specified by the instructional model. Features are the implementation of the general objectives and philosophy of the model. Some respondents saw models and features as virtually synonymous. A few found features to be the more general concept and models the more specific, in contradistinction to the prevailing view.

4) The majority of respondents felt that bilingual education should be open to all. They specified that it should be required for LEP/NEP students and recent immigrants, open to EP language minority students who wish or whose parents wish to maintain some of their language and culture, and available to Anglo students who wish to learn a second language.

Nearly every respondent felt that bilingual education should extend from preschool through high school. A large number felt that it should extend further into the adult years (via adult or post-secondary education).

5) The objectives of bilingual education most often cited are as follows:

Bilingualism/biculturalism
English proficiency
Transition to English mainstream
Preparation for life in the Anglo world
Academic success/progress
Cultural awareness/pride/identity
Maintenance of the home language and culture
Improved self-concept

Less commonly cited objectives are:

Upward social mobility
Leadership skills
Bicognitive skills
Development of multicultural world view

6) A wide range of the positive consequences of bilingual education for students were cited. In order of perceived importance, they are:

Bilingualism/biculturalism
Improved self-concept
Self-confidence/self-reliance
Academic success
Cognitive/bicognitive skills
Ability to cope with the English speaking world
Improved employment opportunities
Diminished ethnocentricity
Educational continuity through post-secondary years
Cultural awareness
Ethnic pride/identity
Positive attitude towards education
Intellectual enrichment
Better familial relations

A few negative consequences were also noted. These included the following:

Marginality of the student
Isolation of the student from the mainstream
Segregation
Lack of educational continuity
Decreased rate in acquisition of English
Confusion about goals and objectives.

Positive effects on the community were thought to include the following:

Community integration
Involvement of the community with the schools
Support of the schools
Community pride/self-worth
Economic progress
Parental assertiveness
Sophistication/cosmopolitanism
Political awareness
Cultural maintenance
Greater diversity
Multiethnic awareness

Possible negative effects were noted in two sites. A few respondents cited a lack of total congruence between school and home objectives in Oakland. Some families felt that the school should not teach the home culture and language. These subjects were thought to be a responsibility of the home and community. These respondents thought that the schools should emphasize English.

The same opinions were present in Rough Rock. Some ambivalence was expressed as to whether school is the proper place for Navajo culture and language. One respondent stated, "Navajo for the home, English for the school." Bilingual education might have negative effects on school-community relations for these respondents

3.1.3 Responses from Teacher Aides, Community Representatives and Parents

1) All of the community representatives and teacher aides who defined bilingual education agreed that it involved the use of two languages, the language of the mainstream (L_2) and that of the student (L_1).

Community representatives and teacher aides divided the purpose of bilingual education into transitional and full bilingual. A less commonly cited purpose was maintenance of the home language and culture. Biculturalism was mentioned infrequently.

Teacher aides more often referred to culture and ultimate bilingualism of students than did community representatives who stressed English fluency. Within one community, the teaching of L_1 to American-born or English-speaking minority culture members was stressed by teacher aides and by community representatives.

2) Significant instructional features in bilingual education included the use of two languages, a cultural component and language arts. Teacher-aides produced more detailed commentary on instruction and gave more program/classroom-oriented interpretation invariably mentioning curriculum content and materials. Teacher aides cited teacher attitudes, teacher qualifications and teacher-student ratios.

3) Teacher aides and community representatives felt that bilingual education programs should include everyone. Some qualified this by stipulating student interest or parental request. Teacher aides and community representatives believe that limited English proficient (LEP) students and nonEnglish (NES) speakers should be included in bilingual education programs. Some recognize funding and resource limitations and indicate that preference should be given to LEP and NES students. The respondents clearly agreed that, ideally, English monolingual students from both the Anglo and the minority cultures should be included.

The years or grade levels in which bilingual education should be made available in school were either: 1) preschool or kindergarten through secondary school, or 2) preschool or kindergarten beyond secondary school through college and/or adult education. The first response was most common.
ties made no mention of years beyond secondary school (Los Angeles and Rough Rock).

4) In commenting on the purposes objectives of bilingual education, teacher aides and community representatives made inconsistent responses. The only two objectives which received attention throughout were the bilingualism and academic progress of students. The improvement of a student's "life chances" options and opportunities, the maintenance of language and/or culture, and biculturalism were mentioned by some teacher aides. Culture and/or language maintenance was mentioned less by community representatives. In one site, community representatives agreed that "life chances," opportunities, options, and social abilities were an important objective of bilingual education programs.

5) Self-concept improvement was mentioned by virtually all teacher aides and community representatives across communities in speaking of the effects of bilingual education on the students' self-concepts. Both respondent

groups frequently mentioned a stronger sense of indentity on the part of the student and growth of pride in the minority culture or heritage, as well. Representatives in various communities also referred to an increase in self-confidence levels.

The effects and long-term consequences of participating in bilingual education programs were seen as entirely positive. Both teacher aides and community representatives pointed to improved academic progress and better education, cultural awareness, biculturalism, bilingualism, improvement of social status, increased social and economic opportunities, and the enhanced ability to cope with and/or adjust to the mainstream culture. Increased language skills and college acceptance possibilities were mentioned more often by teacher aides. Community representatives commented more often on improved student motivation. The possible negative effects, though rarely cited, were slower academic progress or slower English acquisition and possible student confusion.

The effects of bilingual education programs were seen to extend beyond the students participating in those programs. The existence of bilingual education was felt to have a positive effect on the community. The range of opinion as to precisely what these effects were varied widely. Teacher aides and community representatives in some of the cities referred to a general raising of the knowledge base or educational level of the community and to an increase in community involvement. Less consistently expressed opinions shared by community representatives and teacher aides were that the community was generally enriched and unified through an increased understanding of culture and through heritage pride. One possible negative effect was brought up by a few teacher aides in one community--the problem of a lack of congruence between school and home.

3.1.4 Responses From Bilingual Education Representatives

1) Half of the respondents defined bilingual education as instruction in two languages, one of which is English, with attention paid to the student's native culture. Cultural awareness, availability for all students, and maintenance of both linguistic and cultural heritage were also cited.

2) Fifty percent of the respondents cited the teaching of content in the child's dominant language as a significant feature. The teaching of English as a second language, and the bilingualism of the teacher were cited as significant by one-third of the respondents. Other significant features

cited include the utilization of community resources in instruction cultural contact, freedom from ethnic prejudice, bilingualism in the classroom, and biculturality of the teacher.

3) An instructional model was perceived as a guide for teaching and setting goals and objectives. Some respondents felt that a model should be based on the children's needs.

A bilingual instructional model was considered different from a mainstream model in the inclusion of culture, the use of two languages, and the attention to the students' linguistic needs (including the use of the student's native language and maintenance of the student's home culture).

One third of the respondents cited uniformity as the purpose for models in bilingual education. The ability to use models to gauge levels of success was cited by one-third of the respondents. Models are seen as useful to the teachers as guides to insure commonality of objectives and methodologies.

4) Sixty percent of the respondents felt that bilingual education should be open for all students. One-third of the respondents felt that it should be mainly for NES/LES students.

Fifty percent of the respondents indicated that bilingual education programs should span the period from preschool to high school, while the other fifty percent thought that it should include preschool through adulthood.

5) Forty-five percent of the respondents identified the achievement of total bilingualism as the purpose of bilingual education programs. Improvement of students' self-image and educating students to the fullest extent of their capabilities were cited as objectives to include in bilingual education programs. Other objectives cited were: the development of bilingual/bicultural skills, parental involvement, staff development, maintenance of the student's linguistic and cultural heritage, acquisition of English skills for the LEP students, and general enrichment of the student's academic experience.

6) Self-awareness, self-assurance, self-esteem, improved self-concept and ethnic pride were among the long-term consequences of bilingual education specified by the respondents.

Forty-five percent of the respondents cited academic progress as a long-term consequence of bilingual education. Consequences mentioned less frequently were: a diminished level of frustration among students; an increased ability to communicate; a greater stability; and the growth of parental involvement. Bilingual proficiency and biculturalism were considered to be part of the skills necessary for participation in mainstream society.

One-third of the respondents cited greater parental involvement with the school and enhanced cultural pride as some of the bilingual education program's impact on the community. Others indicated higher attendance rates, greater support of schooling among the community and a higher level of group identity.

3.2 Research Approaches - Syntheses of Responses

3.2.1 Responses from SEA and LEA admininistrators

1) Administrators cited the following ways to learn more about the effects of bilingual education for students:

Direct observation
Interviews with teachers, students, and parents
Examination of grades
Longitudinal case studies
Bilingual education - mainstream comparison studies
Evaluation of soft data
Experimentation
Participation of researchers in the educational process

2) Administrators would, in general, include all forms of bilingual education in a study. Specifically mentioned were program types aimed toward full bilingualism, learning disabled and gifted, the arts, enrichment, the transitional mode, maintenance, English proficient students, early childhood experience, and minischools (New York).

All would include non Title VII projects in the study. Title VII was thought to cover only a part of the bilingual education spectrum.

3) About 80% of the administrators were familiar with some bilingual education studies.

Those who were familiar with studies rated them as only fair. In Florida, a respondent drew attention to the fact that no large scale studies had yet been performed there.

Most administrators would concentrate new studies on the children (as the focus of education) rather than the teacher, the school or the district. In Rough Rock, the teacher and the school were considered focal. One respondent cited the district to be important as the context of education.

4) Responses varied from "not too positive" to "very positive" in regard to personal feelings about in-class observations of students.

5) The following characteristics were thought to deserve further study:

Curriculum design
Student achievement
Teacher training
District attitudes towards bilingual education
School environment
Specific roles of the two languages in instruction
Materials

6) Administrators mainly felt that implemented programs varied greatly from school to school.

7) Most thought that bilingual education and mainstream education should differ primarily in the use of languages.

3.2.2 Responses From Teachers and Principals

1) Respondents mentioned the following as the predominant methods to be used to find out about the elements of bilingual education that make a difference for students: interviews and surveys with students, parents, teachers, and administrators; standardized, attitudinal, and criteria-referenced testing; longitudinal case studies; self-esteem inventories; classroom observations; program evaluation; and comparison group studies. The use of experimental, pilot, or demonstration projects was sometimes cited. Many felt that the research should directly involve the community and parents.

2) Many types of programs would be included in analyses. The most frequently cited types were ESL, maintenance, pullout, transitional, full and partial bilingual, and enrichment. Program elements included bicultural content, native language arts, programs for Anglos, arts, and SSL. A large number indicated any programs at all that deal with two lnaguages and two cultures. Specific references were made to bilingual bible schools, the San Francisco newcomer center, churches, Chinese schools (Oakland), community based

recreational programs (Dade Co.), private schools (Los Angeles), after-school programs (New York City), and adult education (Dade Co.).

All agreed that non-Title VII programs should be included in the study. The reason most often cited was that the source of funding was irrelevant. Many commented on the narrowness of Title VII and its concentration on LEP/NEP children to the exclusion of others. Some mentioned the compensatory, deficit model orientation of Title VII.

3) In New York City, Dade Co., and Los Angeles, nearly all teachers and principals and many parents, were familiar with bilingual education studies. In Oakland, about 60% were familiar. In Rough Rock, very few were familiar with such studies.

Most respondents rated studies they were familiar with as fair to good. Many specified defects in these studies. These included presence of too many variables, unrepresentative samples, reliance on statistical methods, cultural bias, inadequate measures, lack of qualitative data, little consideration for needs, badly written reports, small samples, inadequate time frame, focus on ESL, comparison group problems, and lack of concentration on teacher attitudes and skills. Respondents in two cases charged that studies were affected by vested interests and by the commitment of the federal government to monolingualism.

4) The majority of respondents would concentrate a study on students rather than on teachers, the school, or the district. In Oakland, <u>all</u> respondents agreed on this.

5) The proposal that there be in-class observation of children was presented to respondents. Ninety percent of respondents reacted in a positive way to this suggestion. The <u>least</u> support was exhibited in Rough Rock, where about 40% felt "not too positive" about observations. Nowhere did respondents indicate distinctly negative reactions.

6) A list of the characteristics of bilingual education that should be studied further was constructed from responses.

Teacher

Ethnicity
Qualifications
Styles
Strategies
Goals
Competence
Understanding of Purpose

Student

Culture
Learning Styles
Fluency
Social Isolation
Characteristics
Language Use
Skills
Language Dominance

Methodologies

Testing
Team Teaching

Organization

Use of Instructional Time

Interactions

Teacher-Student
Teacher-Staff
Student-Student

Materials

Tests
Other Instruments
Language Materials

Attitudes

Parental
Parent-Student
Teacher-Student
Student
Teacher
Parental Understanding

Consequences

Problem Solving
Changes in Language Use
Language Use by Siblings
Changes in Social Values
Self-Concept
Coping with Mainstream

Curriculum

Language Arts
ESL as L_1 Instruction
ESL
Content in L_1

Models

Objectives
Use of

Context

Community Context

Facilities

Organization

Staffing ratios
Entry/Exit Procedures
Instructional Time Use by Content
Organization into Classes
Management
Distribution of Language Proficiencies in Class
Ethnic Mix

7) About 75% of Los Angeles, Dade Co. and New York City respondents thought that bilingual education programs, as actually implemented, were highly variable from school to school. In Oakland, virtually every respondent agreed with this. The question was not meaningful in Rough Rock, which involves only one elementary school.

8) About 60% in East Los Angeles, Dade, Oakland, and Rough Rock felt that bilingual education and mainstream education should differ. About 80% in New York felt the same. Note that the local areas in each of these sites has a large concentration of language minority students; bilingual education could feasibly be implemented throughout the area.

Those who thought that bilingual education should differ from mainstream education felt that bilingual education embraced different philosophies and objectives, different needs and greater emphasis in cultural issues. Thus, specialized materials and instructional strategies would be required. Many respondents felt that bilingual education should be more supportive and more closely adapted to the needs of individual students.

3.2.3 Responses From Teacher Aides, Community Representatives and Parents

1) All respondents were in favor of research studies and enumerated methods that they felt would be effective. The most often cited was interviewing. Community representatives frequently included children as desirable respondents; teacher aides did not. Both respondent groups include parents, community members, teachers, and school administrators as useful interview respondents. Teacher aides mentioned testing children as a measure of bilingual education impact. The involvement of parents as study participants was suggested by teacher aides and community representatives in one site. Teacher aides suggested student's future job attainment as an impact measure.

2) Community representatives and teacher aides agree that non-Title VII funded programs should be included in bilingual education studies. The fact that other funding sources sponsor bilingual education: that programs are determined by content; and that whatever is beneficial should be examined were reasons for inclusion of other programs. Some felt that a study restricted to TItle VII programs would miss the more flexible programs.

Community need, the availability of funds and the availability of teachers competent in bilingual education were specified prerequisites in opinions about who should be eligible for bilingual education. The eligibility of individual students would be based first on need (LEP and NES students) and then on interest of students and/or parental request. This would ideally involve all students at all grade levels.

3) Very few respondents were familiar with existing bilingual education studies, and the majority of them were from New York City. Teacher aides were more familiar with studies than community representatives. Most felt that the quality of studies varies, but that most are fairly good.

4) Teacher aides and community representatives (with the exception of community representatives in one community) strongly agree that students should be the main focus in studies on bilingual education. Teachers were recognized as being important as the second focus. Opinion was divided about the relative importance of the school and the district.

5) Respondents agree that certain characteristics of bilingual education classrooms require further study. Community representatives and teacher aides frequently cited materials, linguistic issues, and curriculum as examples. Teacher aides feel that it is important to examine the roles of teachers, and the implementation and process of bilingual education. The use of instructional time, distribution of professional levels, languages used by content area, instructional methods, classroom capacity, cultural influence, and translation problems.

6) Most feel that bilingual education varies greatly from school to school within a district. There was disagreement on whether or not bilingual education should differ from mainstream education.

Community representatives thought that bilingual education and mainstream education should differ. Teacher aides did not. Those who advocated the difference in models mentioned disimilar program objectives, and particularized teaching techniques and methods. Community representatives mentioned the cultural component in instruction as something unique to bilingual education.

Teacher aides and community representatives across sites favored participation in a future bilingual education study. Virtually all would agree to filling out a questionnaire and giving an interview. Preference was shown for the questionnaire.

Those who favored the questionnaire cited the time to think over responses more throughly, and the convenience of scheduling. Those who preferred interviews cited more pleasant personal interaction, and the ability

to clarify questions. Community representatives in Oakland stated that limited literacy of respondents made interviews more workable than questionnaires.

Opinion was divided by site as to whether it made a difference if interviews were conducted by community members or by outsiders. Three sites felt it would make a difference; two did not. Most respondents did not feel that interviewing teachers and teacher aides would be difficult.

Interviewing or obtaining questionnaires from parents was advocated by all but one community representative. The majority of the teacher aides agreed. Most respondents agree that interviews and/or questionnaires would be welcomed but a majority of teacher aides feel they would only be tolerated. None indicated outright rejection of these techniques as a possibility.

7) Respondents did not agree on whether it made a difference if classroom observers were outsiders or community members.

The respondents commented on the problem of observer ethnicity. The majority did not feel that the observer and the children observed need to be of the same ethnic group. Teacher aides expressed more ambivalence than did community representatives. New York City representatives almost unanimously agreed that matches of ethnicity were necessary. Those who felt matched ethnicity was important referred to increased understanding of the children culturally and linguistically, understanding of the process, and decreased inhibition of students.

An awareness by observers of child and community background, culture and language were deemed imperative by most community representatives and teacher aides. Some felt that observers should be familiar with the bilingual program and with classroom dynamics. Most respondent felt that both children and teachers should be observed, although the majority said that they would not object to observations focused solely on child benavior.

The prospective level of teacher cooperation with observation was judged to range from moderate to excellent. Outright noncooperation was deemed unlikely. Potential problems with classroom observation were seen as inhibition or behavior changes of the students, inhibition or nervousness of the teacher, and possible disruption.

8) Teacher aides disagreed with the idea that standardized tests were accurate, equitable measures of student achievement and student linguistic ability. However, community representatives frequently felt the opposite. The latter were more inclined to accept the accuracy of standardized tests. Teacher aides agreed that bilingual children are not accurately measured by such tests. The most positive statement that could be made about standardized testing concerned its usefulness as a measure of strengths and weaknesses. Negative qualities of standardized tests mentioned stressed cultural bias and linguistic bias.

3.2.4 Responses From Bilingual Education Representatives

1) Fifty percent of the respondents identified classroom observations as the best way to conduct significant research in bilingual education programs. One-third of the respondents preferred interviewing students as an approach. Other approaches cited were: observation of "model programs," testing the students, and interviewing the parents to explore community attitudes toward bilingual education.

2) Seventy-five percent of the respondents would identify maintenance programs as bilingual education programs. Thirty percent would include transitional programs. A wide variety of programs were mentioned as part of bilingual education: after-school programs, community-based programs, Yeshivas and any program where more than 10% of the students are NES/LES. Within the public school system, they would include vocational programs, minischools, special junior high schools, arts programs and career-oriented programs.

All respondents felt the source of funding to be of little importance for bilingual education.

Sixty percent of the respondents felt that bilingual education should be available to all those students who desire it, or whose parents so wish. One-third of the respondents felt that all NES should have bilingual education available to them. New immigrants and those with remedial needs in reading were also cited as eligible for bilingual education.

3) Ninety percent of the respondents were familiar with studies in bilingual education, and rated them poor to fair.

Some of the reasons given for these ratings were overt concentration on particular ethnic groups, insufficient gathering of data, and abstruse research writing and reporting.

4) Half of the respondents would concentrate on the children for study purposes, half would concentrate on the district.

5) Forty-five percent felt somewhat positive about classroom observation of children; one-third felt very positive about it. Thirteen percent felt rather negative about having researchers observe the children in the classroom.

6) Some of the instructional features (identified by the respondents) which need to be studied further are the long-term effects of bilingual education on children, the levels of academic performance of students, and the academic success of its participants. Teacher training and differences between monolingual and bilingual teachers were also mentioned. Most responses centered on students and teachers although some also refered to materials and attention to testing instruments.

7) Fifty percent of the respondents indicate that bilingual education varies greatly from school to school in District 4; while the other fifty percent perceives it to be pretty much the same throughout the district.

8) Sixty percent of the respondents expressed the conviction that bilingual education should be different from mainstream education; while forty percent felt the opposite.

Those who felt that bilingual education should be particularized pointed to cultural content, and the dissimilarity in focus and services as the reasons for such a difference.

3.3 Measurement and Observations - Synthesis of Responses

3.3.1 Responses From SEA and LEA Administrators

1) All respondents stated that they would be willing to fill out questionnaires.

Most preferred interviews to questionnaires. Questionnaires were thought to be too rigid.

Nearly all agreed that interviews were superior to questionnaries as data collection instruments.

About two-thirds did not object to completing both an interview and a questionnaire. Those who objected did so on the basis of the extra time demanded.

Respondents were asked whether interviews should be conducted by community insiders or outsiders. Results were site specific. In Rough Rock and Dade Co., insiders were preferred. In New York and Oakland, it was not thought to make a difference. Respondents in Los Angeles were equally divided.

Most respondents thought it would not be difficult to interview teachers and teacher aides.

All thought that interviews with parents would provide useful information.

2) In Rough Rock, all respondents thought that the community would welcome attitudinal surveys. Elsewhere (four sites) it was anticipated that these surveys would only be tolerated. None expected outright rejection.

3) Respondents were asked whether the observer's membership in the community made a difference. Results were site specific. In Los Angeles and Oakland it was thought to make a difference; in New York and Rough Rock, it was not; Dade County was divided.

Observers should be of the same ethnic group as the majority of students according to respondents in Dade County and Oakland. In New York City, it was though not to make a difference. Los Angeles and Rough Rock were divided. Those who thought the ethnic match to be important cited the need for cultural understanding, and the comfort of the children.

The following list was generated by respondents concerning what observers should be aware of:

Program Objectives
Instructional Model
Knowledge of Bilingual Education
Curriculum
School Regulations
Schedules

Nearly all respondents felt that in-class observations should concentrate on both children and teachers. A majority would object if only children were observed. About seventy percent felt that teachers would range from somewhat

to very cooperative with observations. No one felt that teachers would provide no cooperation at all. The most negative effects of observation were seen to be the time burden and inhibitions aroused. One response described observations was intimidating. It was emphasized that observations should be scheduled in advance to avoid disruption.

4) Most respondents strongly disagreed with the proposition that language proficiency was accurately and equitably measured by standardized tests. Only one respondent agreed. The same pattern was observed for standardized tests of academic performance. The strongest statement in favor of standardized tests was that they provide a standard for evaluation. Most would offer no positive comment. Standardized tests were considered biased, unfair, inaccurate, and designed for the Anglo middle class. No one felt that standardized tests were "accurate".

5) All respondents would include teacher aides as well as teachers in the study.

3.3.2 Responses From Teachers and Principals

1) Virtually every respondent indicated willingness to fill out a questionnaire.

Respondents were equally divided in their preferences for an interview or a questionnaire.

Those who preferred questionnaires cited the longer time available to think and to organize a reply, the ability to fill out the form at leisure, less time-burden, and the ability to work at their own rates. Those who preferred interviews cited face-to-face contact, the ability to clarify questions, to elaborate answers and to express feelings, and the openness of the format.

Three quarters of the New York respondents felt that the interview was a superior means to collect data. Elsewhere, respondents were about equally divided.

Very few of the teachers and principals objected to responding in both formats. Those who did object cited the time burden.

About sixty percent felt that it made a difference whether interviews were conducted by a community insider or an outsider. In Rough Rock, seventy percent felt so. A few respondents stated that an external interviewer would be more objective.

In Los Angeles, Oakland, and New York City about ninety percent felt that interviewing teachers and teacher aides would not be difficult. In Rough Rock, seventy percent felt so; in Dade Co., only sixty percent felt so

Approximately ninety-five percent of the respondents considered that parent interviews would be valuable in a study.

2) Respondents were asked whether the local community would welcome, or at least tolerate questionnaires and interviews about their feelings and attitudes. None of the respondents indicated that this approach would be rejected outright. In Los Angeles, the large majority would welcome this approach, and in Oakland a majority would do so. In Rough Rock, Dade County, and New York City, a majority would tolerate but not welcome these approaches.

3) The vast majority of respondents in Rough Rock indicated that classroom observations should be conducted by a community insider. In the other sites, about sixty percent felt that they should.

In Dade County and Rough Rock, respondents were equally divided on whether an in-class observer should belong to the same ethnic group as the majority of observed students. Two-thirds of the Oakland respondents felt there should be such an ethnic match. In Los Angeles and New York City, sixty percent felt that it made no difference.

Those who felt that it made a difference cited greater accuracy in interpreting the process; greater sensitivity and better understanding of children's needs, language, and culture; and students' greater ease in the presence of an observer.

Many cited specific knowledge that in-class observers should have:

Ethnic composition of class
Students' cultural background
Understanding of students' language
Students' language proficiencies/dominance
Bilingual education philosophy and goals
Class schedules and curriculum
Objectives, philosphy, and techniques of teacher
Educational, instructional theory
Socioeconomic background of children
Students' needs
Students' attitudes
Teacher qualifications/background

The vast majority felt that both teachers and students should be observed.

A sizable minority would object if only students were observed.

Very few respondents thought that teachers would not cooperate with the in-class observation research. About 85% felt that teachers would be only somewhat cooperative in Rough Rock. In the other sites, teachers are expected to be somewhat-to-very cooperative.

Many cited negative effects of in-class observations. The specified were:

Inhibition of teachers and students
Distraction of class
Disturbance of teachers and students
Nervousness
Intimidation of teacher

Many confused in-classroom observation with the type of observation associated with teacher evaluation. The need for advanced scheduling, long observation times, and thorough preparation were often mentioned.

4) Nearly all respondents rejected standardized tests for assessing either language proficiency or student achievement. Oakland expressed the strongest support for standardized tests (twenty percent of respondents).

Most respondents refused to make any positive comment about standardized tests. A few cited greater reliability, ease of administration, and the need to assess students - even if the only instruments available are imperfect. Many respondents stated that tests are necessary to satisfy federal and state agencies in order to secure continued funding.

A large number of unfavorable opinions about standardized tests were voiced:

Invalidity
Unreliability
Ethnic/cultural/socioeconomic bias
Improperly normed
Inappropriate domain of measurement
Language tests exclude communicative competence
Fear evoking
Used to classify children improperly
Self defeating/deceptive

Nearly every respondent labelled standardized tests as "inaccurate" when specifically asked.

3.3.3 Responses from Bilingual Education Representatives

1) All respondents expressed willingness to fill out a questionnaire concerning their attitudes towards bilingual education. Fifty percent would favor an interview. Thirty percent would have no preference between interview and questionnaire. Twenty percent would prefer a questionnaire. Those who expressed a preference for the questionnaire form did so because they consider them easier. Those who preferred an interview did so because of their perception of questionnaires as "cut and dry" and because of the possibility of misunderstandings. Most respondents felt that ainterviews allowed them to elaborate on their answers, and that they were more personal. None of the respondents felt that questionnaires were better than interviews. None would object to doing both.

Seventy-five poercent of the respondents did not feel that community membership status of the interviewer makes any difference. Only twenty-five percent felt that it makes a difference if bilingual education interviewers are conducted by a member of the community as opposed to someone from outside the community.

Ninety percent of the respondents felt that interviewing teachers and teacher aides about their views on bilingual education would not be difficult.

2) All bilingual representatives thought that interviewing parents would provide useful information about bilingual education. Sixty percent of the respondents in New York City felt that conducting attitudinal research about bilingual education in District 4 would be welcomed, one-third of the respondents felt that it would be tolerated. In no case was it felt that such a study would be rejected.

3) Two-thirds of the bilingual representatives felt that it would make a difference if a bilingual classroom observer were a member of the community or not. All respondents felt that an in-classroom observer should be of the same ethnic group as the majority of the children in the classroom. No reasons were given.

Some specific items were cited as important for an observer to be aware of before observing bilingual education classes. They are: 1) knowledge of the community; 2) knowledge about the ethnic group represented in the classroom; 3) knowledge about the students' background; 4) knowledge about the philosophy of bilingual education and of the program; 5) program goals and entry-exit

criteria; 6) general attitude towards bilingual education and obstacles to implementation; 7) conversant with the structure for language use, any schedules in operation, and had knowledge about the nature of the composition of the class; and 8) knowledge about the level of experience of the teacher.

All respondents would prefer to have observations that focused on both teachers and students. Eighty percent would object to observations concerned solely with the behavior of students.

Fifty percent of the respondents in New York expect the teachers in District 4 to be very cooperative if observed as part of the research effort. Fifty percent felt that they would be somewhat cooperative.

Sixty percent of the bilingual representatives did not feel that in-classroom observations would have any negative effects. Twenty percent of the respondents felt that teachers' nervousness could be the most negative effect.

4) Two-thirds of the respondents strongly disagreed with the idea that standardized testing is the most equitable and accurate method of assessing bilingual education students' language ability. More mild disagreement was expressed by the remainder.

There was strong disagreement (eighty percent) with the statement that standardized tests provided an equitable and accurate method of assessing bilingual students' achievement. Ten percent voiced mild disagreement while the remaining ten percent agreed with the statement.

None of the respondents could produce a favorable statement about standardized tests for bilingual education.

Some of the unfavorable statements mentioned were: tests are not normed on bilingual populations, they produce inaccurate results; and they reflect lack of knowledge about bilingual education and are unreliable as a measure. None of the respondents felt that standardized tests, as they presently exist, produce accurate measures for bilingual students.

3.4 Data Available in School Files

Several questions were asked about the extent of data available in local school files, and the potential for access to these data. The answers provided only the most general guide. If any site is seriously considered for the study, the information must be much more specific about precise data points and organization that could be obtained through short interviews.

Certain conclusions were nearly constant across all five sites and, for the sake of brevity, will be presented only once. These conclusions are as follows.

Access to the files is, in general, very easy for insiders and difficult for outsiders. Permissions will be required at all levels including the District Office and parents of students whose data are to be examined. Access is also limited by law, e.g., in California and New York City.

Records were kept at the individual schools rather than in a centralized file system in the sites surveyed. They were not computerized and may even be difficult to find in some cases. A student's record follows him/her through the grades in a particular school. An academic summary usually is forwarded when the student changes schools. It is the general experience in working with such data that they are usually nonuniform and difficult to deal with--in contrast to centralized systems such as that maintained in Philadelphia. The research approach taken will have to be site-specific. In fact new data collection may need to be site-specific in order to mesh with site testing programs and to avoid unnecessary test burdens.

Information is usually updated on an ad hoc basis as data becomes available--e.g., from the school nurse, the teacher, specialists, or the research and evaluation committee.

The conclusions presented here may soon change for the case of New York City, where a central computerized system (METROLAB) is being put into effect. It is not clear whether this system will be implemented soon enough to affect the instructional features study or, when it is implemented, whether existing paper records will be entered into the system.

The contents of the existing files differ from site to site. The following surveys were assembled by combining responses of teachers and principals in each site.

Dade County

- Demographic Data
- Academic Performance
- Test Scores
- Special Education Data
- Health Data
- Language Proficiency Data

New York City

- Test Scores
- Grades
- Personality Ratings
- Family Information
- Regents Scores
- Honors/Awards
- Academic History from Previous Schools
- Health Data
- Attendance Record
- Teacher Evaluation

Los Angeles

- Language Proficiency Data
- Test Scores
- Grades
- Report Cards
- Health Data
- Psychological Data
- Demographic Data
- Parent Comments
- Teacher and Staff Comments

Oakland

- Test Scores
- Personal Data
- Grades
- Classes Attended
- Health Record
- Progress Chart
- Parent Interview
- Language Plan
- Language Assessment
- Parent Comments

Rough Rock

- Diagnostic Tests
- Grades
- Health Data
- Anecdotal Data
- Aptitude Tests
- Personality Data
- Personal Information
- Academic Record
- Disciplinary Data

3.5 Permissions and Support for the Study

3.5.1 Dade County

Who should be contacted?

If the study is to be accepted, approval and cooperation must be secured at all levels of the school system, as well as the community. However, there are certain protocols that should be followed in attempting to obtain cooperation. The school board was identified as ultimately responsible for actually committing Dade County to a study. First contacts should be made with the superintendent's office. The Dade County Bilingual Education Office (headed by Gabriel Valdez, an interviewee) serves an advisory function - the LEA's are largely autonomous. The bilingual education office is most knowledgeable and most directly interested in studies to be conducted. They would be open to an explanation of the study design and objectives and, if they approve, would help in approaching other administrators.

Support of the LEA

Some of the best ways of obtaining the support of the LEA cited were:

- observing formal protocol;
- obtaining letters of recommendation from Washington;
- showing support of parents;
- communicating soundness of research design; and
- minimizing disturbance.

The most important element cited was to provide revenues to the LEA that would compensate them for their incremental costs and additional work burden.

The overall cooperation and interest of the Dade County School system is likely to be high. Respondents indicated that no major federal study had yet been funded in Florida - just a sequence of graduate student studies. There was some sentiment that the Cuban bilingual population has been neglected.

Support of Principals, Teachers, Teacher Aides

The support of principals is critical after permissions and support have been obtained from the LEA.

Continuous contact with the principals for a period of two school years is incorporated in the design envisioned. The principals surveyed indicated that they key elements in obtaining support were:

- explaining the importance of the study;
- offering to compensate teachers and teacher aides;
- demonstrating parental support;
- explaining study objectives and the benefits likely to occur for children;
- demonstrating that the study will engender little or no additional burden on school resources;
- offering resources to the system;
- explaining benefits for the system;
- assuring that there will be little disturbance;
- explaining study objectives; and
- observing protocol.

In general, teachers and principals were positive about research. The following benefits were cited:

- detection of program weaknesses;
- improvement of instruction;
- reflection of the educational process; and
- documentation of program effectiveness.

While teachers and principals did not foresee reasons why permission might be denied, some reservations were expressed. Potential problems cited were:

- excessive test burden;
- lack of clarity of purpose;
- time burden;
- lack of clear direct local benefits; and
- lack of credibility of the research design.

Support of Parents

None of the respondent groups thought that parent groups (such as PAC's) had much influence on decision making. Many thought that they had no influence at all. About fifty to ninety percent level of cooperation is expected from partents. The respondents suggest trying to overcome any objections that may be made rather than abandoning the site. The best ways to elicit cooperation, roughly in order of importance were:

- explaining the importance of the study for their children's education;
- showing how other studies have benefited children;
- explaining the importance of the study for development of better programs;
- explaining objectives; and
- holding conferences and meetings.

Most respondents thought that parents would be interested in participating in a study in order to find out more about their children's education and bilingual education, and to get involved with the programs.

Compensation

Nearly all respondents felt that teachers and teacher aides should be paid for participation. The amount most frequently cited was the regular hourly rate - subject to any special provisions of the teaching contract.

3.5.2 Los Angeles

Who Should be contacted?

The first persons and groups that should be contacted are the Research and Evaluation Office Director and the Bilingual Education Program personnel. They have the most direct interest in the study and the most specific knowledge of bilingual education. The study design and objectives should be presented to them. These persons can then contact the superintendent's office or arrange meetings between study personnel and the office.

Support of the LEA

The Board of Education and the superintendent have the authority to commit the LEA to a study. Their support must be obtained if the study is to be conducted. The factors that might weigh against acceptance of the study are interference with the educational process, fears of partiality, imposition of additional work burden or costs and too many studies. There may be problems administering any additional tests because of the heavy load already imposed by local and state authorities. Positive factors are

the resulting production of knowledge, clarification of bilingual education, potential improvements in bilingual educatior and potential positive input on support and funding. The support of the LEA can best be obtained by providing full explanation of the study design, specific expectations of the school district, assurance that new costs will not be imposed and pointing explicit benefits to education, children and the district. The LEA would like to be involved in the planning process. Most respondents saw no reason why the study would be rejected.

There are public laws in California governing the collection of data in the public schools. These are incorporated in district policy so that obtaining district support is contingent on adherence to these laws.

Respondents varied considerably in their estimates of the amount of advance notice required to conduct a study in their school. The majority agreed on about 3-4 months but estimates ranged from weeks to up to one year.

Support of Area Superintendent

Los Angeles is decentralized into areas. One of them East Los Angeles the study site considered here. The support of the area office must be secured followed by that of the district office, largely through the same procedures.

Support of Principals, Teachers, Teacher-Aides

The cooperation of principals is best obtained by going through the channels (i.e., by seeing the superintendent first). The same advantages pointed out to the BOE and superintendent hold for in-school building personnel as well. Many would like to receive information as the study produces results and to participate in the process.

Most respondents agree that both teachers and teacher-aides should be paid at their regular hourly rate (as set in the union contract) for any additional hours that they contribute. Few respondents thought that there would be difficulties with teacher cooperation. The major reservations are additional workload and the fear of negative evaluations as they relate to job security. Assur that the study, and teacher observations in particular, are nonevaluative is vital.

Support of Parents

Most respondents feel that parent groups do not have too much influence on school decision making. Nevertheless, the support of parents must be obtained if the study is to succeed. The expected level of cooperation is about forty percent. Over half of the respondents feel that any strong resistance from parents it can be overcome by explaining the study. Also mentioned as means to secure cooperation are paying of fees and explaining the importance of the study for their children's education and for better bilingual education instruction.

3.5.3 New York City

Who should be contacted?

The administrators in New York City identified the superintendent, the chancellor, principals and administrators as those with the authority to commit a school or classroom in the district to be studied. One-third of the principals identified the superintendent as the source of permission. The rest mentioned the High School Division of the Bilingual Office, the Office of Bilingual Education, and the District Office as the source.

One-third of the teachers asserted that the Parent Advisory Committee had some influence in the decision-making process ne-third felt that they did not have much influence. One-third indicated that they had no influence at all. Two-thirds of the principals felt that the PAC did not have much influence in the decision. The remainder stated that the PAC had no influence at all.

Support of the LEA

The administrators cited meetings with the superintendent, approval from the Office of Bilingual Education, honest approach, and thorough explanation of the research design and implications as ways to obtain the cooperation of the LEA. The principals recommended the incorporation of the LEA in the planning stages and inclusion of the LEA members in discussions as ways of obtaining their cooperation.

The administrators cautioned us about the impending shift in research resource allocation in New York City. They indicate that if the new law is passed, any research to be conducted in New York City Public Schools must fit into the research plan currently in preparation or it would not be approved.

The administrators identified direct access as the best way to obtain the cooperation of the superintendent's office, while the principals felt that talking with him/her was the best way. One principal suggested animosity toward bilingual education as a possible reason for lack of cooperation.

The administrators identified forty to ninety percent as the most likely level of cooperation to be expected in New York City. They also indicated that it would be harder to obtain cooperation in September due to prevailing chaos during that month. Half of the principals thought that one could expect a fairly high level of cooperation; twenty five percent felt that total cooperation could be expected; and twenty five percent expected a very low level of cooperation in the community. One-third of the teachers felt that a less than optimal level of cooperation could be expected; one-fifth thought it could be high; while the rest were evenly distributed between expecting a medium level of cooperation and not quite so high a level of cooperation in New York City. None of the respondents felt that cooperation would be totally denied.

Support of Principals, Teachers, and Teacher Aides

Principles felt that the best way to get their support was by explaining the study to them. Going to the superintendent first was also mentioned, as was simply by asking. Teachers felt that the principals would cooperate if the value of the study and benefits to the school were pointed out. Making the results accessible to them was also deemed important.

The administrators thought that securing the teachers' cooperation for a study would depend on the burden it might represent to the teachers. Ninety percent of the principals and teachers did not foresee any difficulties in securing the teachers' cooperation.

Among the ways to approach teachers for their cooperation cited by the principals were direct contact with the teachers indicating how it would help them to provide better instruction; going through the principal for permission. Teachers identified the following ways to overcome their possible objections: clarifying the purpose and value of the study for bilingual education; explaining the level of importance of participation; giving feedback to the teachers; and identifying possible positive outcomes.

All respondents indicated that teacher aides or paraprofessionals should be included in any study dealing with bilingual education.

Support of Parents

All principals, teachers and administrators felt that parental objections to the study, if any, should be overcome by explaining the study to the parents, answering questions and including parents in the research itself. Teachers deemed it crucial to convince the parents of the importance of the study.

Compensation

Two-thirds of the teachers felt that they should be paid in order to participate; all the principals felt that they should not be paid; and all the administrators felt that they should be paid. Those who felt that teachers should be paid to participate mentioned that they should be paid: (a) at less than their hourly rate; (b) $15/hour; or (c) $12/hour.

Two-thirds of the administrators felt that teacher aides or paraprofessionals should be paid as much as or more than the teachers. All principals felt that they should not be paid at all and two-thirds of the teachers felt that they should be paid. Sixty percent of the teachers felt that teacher aides or paraprofessionals should be paid less than the teachers, and all principals felt that they should not be paid at all.

3.5.4 Oakland

Who should be contacted?

Respondents generally agreed that the first person to contact is the Director of the Office of Bilingual Education. Others who do not fall under the Office of Bilingual Education e.g., the Director of the Lincoln Center, a preschool program might also be contacted. As in the other sites discussed, these individuals have the most direct interest in the study. The study should be explained in detail so that they can transmit the information to the District Office and arrange for meetings with administrators there.

Support of the LEA

The superintendent is the person responsible for granting or denying permission for a study. Reasons for denial might include the burden on staff

time, additional costs, the feeling that the study might be biased or unfavorable to bilingual education, conflict with schedules, interference with instruction, the lack of perceived benefits, resistance in individual schools, lack of interest or additional testing burden. About two-thirds saw no strong reason why the study would be rejected. Some of the advantages of research cited are the documentation of effectiveness, support of the program, potential increase in federal funding, the availability of new district-level data, program evaluation, and potential improvements in instructional practices. It is considered important to explain to the superintendent and/or his/her staff the advantages of this particular proposed study and how the study will help their program, why the study is needed, how it might influence funding and what the other benefits may be. There should be ample time scheduled for this. Time to brief parents and then to assure the superintendent of their acceptance of the study should be included in the schedule.

Support of Principals, Teachers, and Teacher Aides

The principals are responsible for committing particular schools to the study. Their permission and cooperation must be secured. Cooperation at the local school level might be more difficult to obtain since principals are closer to any disruptive effects that might occur. The principals will, of course, be strongly influenced by the support of the superintendent which must be obtained first. The approach to the principals should be similar to that of the superintendent but should be more specific about detailed expectations at the individual school level.

Most respondents agreed that teachers and teacher aides should be paid at their regular hourly rates for participation in the study. The respondents did not see major difficulties in securing teacher cooperation. The reasons cited for potential noncooperation were: the additional burden, inadequate explanation, potential disruption, and the lack of specific feedback. Workshops and meetings might be conducted in which objections are addressed and the potential benefits explained in order to secure cooperation. The study can and should be designed to minimize or eliminate the disadvantages cited by the teachers.

Support of Parents

The parent advisory committee was thought by about one-half of the respondents to have some influence or very much influence on the decision to

allow or deny access for research. Since parent support is essential to the design of the study, these groups must be convinced of its merits.

The methods enumerated for enlisting the cooperation of community people include payment of fees; explaining the importance of the study for development of better programs and for their children's education; and explaining specific benefits that other communities have received.

Most respondents expected about ninety percent cooperation from all parents. They generally agreed that if there were resistance to the study it would be best to try to convince the parents rather than to move to a new site. Some suggested approaching them through the teachers, giving full explanations, educating them about bilingual education, and allowing parents to fully voice their feelings in meetings.

3.5.5 Rough Rock

Who should be contacted?

All respondents identified the Board of Education as the agency to be contacted for permission to conduct a study in Rough Rock.

At the LEA level, the Executive Director of the Demonstration School (Mr. Jimmy Begaye) was identified as the person in charge of granting permission within the Board. Both teachers and principals felt that the advisory committee would not have much influence in the decision-making process regarding access to the school.

Support of the LEA

All administrators indicated that involvement in the planning stages of the study would be the best way to obtain the Executive Director's cooperation. Teachers and principals cited thorough explanation of the study, open communication, promise of the study resulting in more money related to students, and appeal to cultural pride as ways of obtaining the cooperation of the Executive Director.

The expected level of cooperation cited by the administrators in Rough Rock ranged from fair to excellent. At the teacher's and principal's level, fair to good was more prevalent.

Support of Principals, Teachers, and Teacher Aides

Among teachers and principals, fifty percent felt that there might be difficulties in obtaining the teachers' cooperation. None of the administrators felt that there would be any difficulty.

Some of the reasons cited for the teachers' possible lack of cooperation were: limited availability of time; additional work burden, lack of involvement on the part of the teachers; lack of responsibility, and worries about possible evaluation of their teaching skills.

All administrators, teachers, and principals think that teacher aides or paraprofessionals should be included in any study dealing with bilingual education.

Support of Parents

All respondents felt that any objections to the conducting of the study on the part of members of the community should be overcome. However, they did not foresee that there would be great resistance to overcome if the study was explained to the parents, it involved them in their homes and the benefits to the children were emphasized.

Explaining the importance of the study for future development of bilingual education, its impact on the children's educational future, and how other communities have benefited from similar studies were most often cited as ways for enlisting the cooperation of the community by teachers, principals, and bilingual education directors.

Compensation

None of the administrators felt that the teachers should be paid except in those instances when work outside of their regular hours was required. However, two-thirds of the teachers and principals felt that they should be paid. Those who thought they should be paid suggested their regular hourly rate, $20; and $50 per classroom, as appropriate compensation.

The administrators felt that teacher aides or paraprofessionals should not be paid except in the case of work involving hours outside their regular schedule. Teachers and principals were equally divided on whether they should be paid or not.

Forty percent of those who felt that they should be paid specified the same rate as the teachers. Half the remainder of those in favor of payment thought they should be paid less and half that they should be paid more than the teachers.

4. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE STUDY

This section presents some of the implications of the field verification for working definitions of terms and for design of the instructional features study. The syntheses presented in Section 3 are for the most part self-explanatory. They show that the study designs recommended in Planning Paper 4 are credible and acceptable to bilingual education practitioners at all levels. Only a few of the more important implications for the study are discussed here, due to time limitations.

The topics discussed include: (1) implications for the working definitions of terms presented in Planning Paper 1; (2) implications for sample design; (3) techniques of data collection; (4) suggested approaches to LEAs and schools; and (5) implications for identification of on-site staff. The subsections below are organized accordingly.

4.1 Definitions of Terms in Bilingual Education

In Planning Paper 1, alternative definitions of the terms, "bilingual education," "consequences for children," "instructional features," "significant," and "model" were developed. Through the field verification effort we have tried to ascertain the extent to which our definitions reflect the prevailing opinion among bilingual education practitioners, administrators, parents and members of the community.

4.1.1 Bilingual Education

Three alternative definitions of bilingual education have been proposed in Planning Paper 1. The first definition focused on the utilization of two languages to help limited English proficiency students acquire the necessary skills for optimal functioning in mainstream classrooms, as well as helping them improve their academic performance and thus improve their long term life chances.

The second definition focused on identifying the intended population for bilingual education - language minority children with limited English proficiency -including all grades in school from K-12 and not limited to those programs funded by Title VII.

The third definition focused more on the language minority student and stressed inclusion of all those elements which have tangible consequences

for the language development of students, as well as those of consequence for their cultural, social, academic, attitudinal and/or affective characteristics. It encompassed formal as well as informal instruction, spanning the whole range of instructional levels from K-12. It was not limited to any given context.

The most inclusive definition of bilingual education proposed in Planning Paper 1 appears to strike at the core of what practitioners and stakeholders of diverse linguistic groups and occupational standings in bilingual education identify as essential. The educational settings cited by respondents across sites concentrate on the students involved, not on the nature of the projects. Any project would be included, regardless of setting, sponsorship, funding source, or program orientation. The range of grades suggested in alternative definition 2 spanned kindergarten through high school. Across sites, respondents indicated that bilingual education should be offered from preschool through college or adult education.

Most practitioners considered the definition of bilingual education to be closely tied to the role of two languages in the instruction of children of linguistic minorities with limited English proficiency. Very few (only the Rough Rock respondents) would restrict it to limited English proficiency students. The availability of bilingual instruction on demand was mentioned by the majority of respondents across sites, regardless of linguistic dominance. There was a variation regarding the use of two languages as a definition of bilingual education: most LEA administrators, teachers, and principals identified the home language as the preferred medium of instruction.

There was little variation regarding a definition of bilingual education across the different categories of practitioners contacted. Maintenance of the home language and culture and the use of L_1 to teach content and L_2 were cited more often by teachers and principals. Respondents in Oakland perceived the use of L_1 in content instruction as a way to facilitate academic progress rather than for maintenance purposes. All practitioners considered the aim to improve the long term life chances of the students as part and parcel of a definition of bilingual education.

Overall, all three definitions of bilingual education forwarded in Planning Paper 1 were cited by various practitioners and community representatives.

4.1.2 Consequences for Students

Two definitions of consequences for students were proposed in Planning Paper 1. The first definition identified appreciation for the students' culture and that of others, the acquisition of necessary skills for integration with mainstream education, improved academic performance in reading, math and social studies, and positive impact on life chances.

The second definition included the effects on the social, linguistic, attitudinal or economic status of students, including any short term consequences, i.e., any effect that might alter the students' life within the immediate future, or that might bear substantially on the long term consequences; it also considered the effect that bilingual education may have collectively, on the students' home culture.

All community representatives and teacher aides across sites included cultural awareness, biculturalism and the enhanced ability to cope with and/or adjust to the mainstream culture as positive consequences for children exposed to bilingual education. Principals and teachers identified biculturalism as an important consequence, followed by improved self-concept and self-awareness. Improved academic performance, including increased language skills that will insure academic progress, was also cited across sites by teacher aides, community representatives and bilingual education administrators as important consequences for participating students. The impact on the life chances of students was expressed by all respondents as long-term consequences: upward social mobility; economic success; and improved social relations.

The consequences of bilingual education were not perceived by the practitioners and various stakeholders to be restricted to the participating students.

Most teacher aides and community representatives expressed the belief that bilingual education has a positive effect on the community and, in particular, raises the general educational level of the community. Collective involvement, enrichment, community integration and better understanding of their own culture and heritage were also cited by community representatives as related effects.

The following effects on the social, linguistic, attitudinal and economic status of students were mentioned: coping with the English-speaking world; improvement of social status; better social and economic opportunities; and a diminished sense of ethnocentrism. The achievement of English proficiency, the ability to communicate more efficiently and increased language skills in both English and the home language were cited, as well. Being exposed to bilingual education was felt to be conducive to an improved self-concept and awareness of self and improved student motivation by members of the community, teacher aides and administrators. Most bilingual education representatives cited a diminution of the level of frustration among students and enhanced self-esteem as important consequences for students. Economic success in later life was consistently mentioned as an important consequence across sites by respondents in all work categories. This was coupled with the increased chance of being college-bounds improving the students' social status and the acquisition of leadership skills.

Short term consequences cited were higher attendance rates and an increase in self confidence levels.

In Rough Rock, most respondents stated that bilingual education helps the community to value its own language.

There were, however, some possible negative effects cited as part of bilingual education consequences for children: a possible slowing of academic progress and/or English acquisition; students confusion. Some teachers and principals in Oakland felt that there is a resulting lack of congruence between the community function and the school function.* Some teachers and principals noted the following negative consequences: lack of educational continuity, charge of marginality; segregation, and isolation of the students from the mainstream; confusion about goals and objectives, and a decrease in the rate of acquisition of English.

There is ambivalence as to whether the school is the proper place for Navajo culture and language. One respondent stated: "Navajo for the home, English for the school." For these respondents, the consequences of

---

*Some families felt that the school should not teach the home culture and language, which were thought to be a responsibility of the home and the community. The same theme was cited in Rough Rock.

bilingual education on school-community relations are of a negative nature. The overwhelming majority perceived the consequences of bilingual education to be of a very positive nature, both for the children and for the communities involved.

Thus, the second definition in Planning Paper 1 reflects the wide range of consequences evoked by most respondents.

4.1.3 Significant Instructional Features

The third term discussed in Planning Paper 1 was that of instructional features. Three alternative definitions are offered: the first one includes all the teaching and learning processes in bilingual classrooms, as well as any classroom characteristics and behaviors with consequences for linguistic minority students. The second definition was expanded to include all teaching and learning processes in and around the school which include linguistic minority students. The third definition is all-encompassing. It identifies instructional features as the entire teaching and learning process involving linguistic minority students--formally or informally, in the classroom, the school, at home and in the community.

It was not feasible to verify these definitions in isolation from that of "significance." A significant instructional feature in bilingual education was defined as instructional features which are likely to have substantial and meaningful consequences on the students' lives. A second, alternative definition was presented--namely, as instructional feature which describes classrooms, school or community phenomena and which is conceptually generalizable.

The instructional features most emphasized across the five sites by teachers and principals were the teaching of English as a second language, maintenance and teacher qualifications. These features were also considered to be "significant." The following additional features were regarded as significant for bilingual education:

a. The use of L_1 in the classroom both as a resource and as a medium to teach content, be it new or familiar material;

b. The use of dialectal linguistic varieties in the classroom;

c. Early childhood education in the language of the home;

d. The teaching of basic skills and language arts in both languages;

e. Coordination of L_1 and L_2 objectives;

f. Group size;

g. One-to-one practice;

h. Pull out;

i. Testing;

j. Attention to learning styles;

k. Tests;

l. Audiovisual aids;

m. Pertinent, cross-cultural materials available in the native language of the children;

n. A curriculum that is congruent with the needs of students and multiethnic, as well as meaningful for LES/NES students;

o. Teacher qualifications, including certification in L_1 and full bilingualism;

p. Full commitment as a role model;

q. Bilingualism of teacher aides;

r. Use of teacher aides; and

s. Inservice training for both teachers and teacher aides.

The third definition of instructional features in Planning Paper I was supported by respondents from all sites. Children's use of L_1 and L_2 in the community, awareness of teachers about the bilingual community, multiethnic content of the curriculum, utilization of community resources in instruction, culture contact, and freedom from ethnic prejudice were singled out as significant instructional features.

3.1.4 Instructional Models

Two alternative definitions of "model" were presented. The first characterizes a model as a pattern or cluster of significant instructional

features as they occur naturally, and as a representation of different approaches to bilingual education as practiced in the classroom.

The second definition identifies a model as an overall pattern or plan more or less well-defined, which can be used to shape curriculum, select instructional materials, guide teacher actions and control instructional features of bilingual education. All LEA administrators, teachers, principals and bilingual education representatives across sites perceived and defined a model as a guide for teaching and setting goals and objectives. The LEA administrators saw an instructional model as a structure for teaching. They included the following elements: time and frequency of use of each language by content area; staff patterns; and curriculum. They also felt that models helped to organize, plan and evaluate teaching. Other characteristics mentioned were that the model specifies organization, materials, and strategies.

Most respondents felt that a bilingual instructional model should differ from a mainstream model. Elements that were thought to differ in the bilingual model include the use of two languages in instruction; inclusion of a cultural component; emphasis of maintenance of the home language and culture; adaptation of instruction to the students and the community; relating instruction to the native culture; cultural sensitivity and awareness; use of materials in L_1; greater supportiveness; transitional approaches; presentation of Anglo ideas in L_1; and the promotion of positive cultural images.

Ideally, a model was sought to be replicable, of proven success, implementable and specific in its objectives. Some administrators mentioned that an external planner can use a model as a tool for program implementation in a reasonably uniform way. Successful programs may be replicated; so that the model serves as a framework for program improvement. It may be used to transfer successful programs to new sites, and to obtain consistency in program implementation.

4.2 Sample Design

The field verification effort proved the feasibility and appropriateness of the basic sample design most strongly recommended in Planning Paper 4. The basic ideas of this design were as follows:

1) The primary sample unit (PSU) is the LEA or its near equivalent.

2) These LEAs are selected purposively so as to satisfy a design stratified by predominant language groups and geographical area, with representation of secondary strata such as urban/rural.

3) The sample frame of primary interest consists of the language minority students--K through 12--who live in the area, regardless of their language and ethnic group (e.g., Chinese living in East Los Angeles would be included as an interesting subsample of minority students immersed in a second minority culture).

4) The sample frame of institutions consists of all formal and informal organizations that the students encounter and that appear to matter for their development and education.

The following paragraphs present findings from the field verification that bear upon this design.

The LEA as Primary Sampling Unit

The field verification showed that, for Navajo students, an examination of local political geography must be made.

Rough Rock is a small community in Apache County, Arizona, near Chinle, in the heart of the Navajo Indian Reservation. The reservation itself extends into four states (Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah) although most lies within Apache and Navajo Counties, AZ. The Rough Rock Demonstration School was founded in 1966 as the first school in the United States under direct Indian control. There are three components--Elementary School, Middle School and High School. All top administrative positions and fifty percent of teaching positions are filled by Navajos.

Most of the Rough Rock Demonstration School children come from traditional Navajo families within a 20-mile radius of the school. About one-third are boarding students because of different transportation conditions within the reservation. The Rough Rock Demonstration School has no recognized attendance zone and can be seen as just one of the options available to parents.

The Rough Rock Demonstration School is one of four types of schools for Navajo students within the reservation. These types are as follows:

1) Contract Schools, like Rough Rock or Rock Point Schools, are managed and controlled by Navajos under funding contracts with the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA).

2) BIA Schools, are controlled, managed and staffed by BIA directly.

3) Public Schools, like Chinle Elementary School, are part of the conventional Arizona Public School system.

4) Mission Schools, are controlled and administered by the Roman Catholic Church as a remnant of the once widespread mission system of the Southwest.

The four public school LEAs that exist in the Apache County area of the Navajo Indian Reservation are listed in Table 1, together with data from the Office for Civil Rights Survey File.

We would propose that the Navajo Study Unit consist of this portion of the reservation, which includes its tribal seat of government, Window Rock. The sample frame of schools would consist of all those within this area (i.e., a number of BIA, contract, public, and mission schools offering distinct forms of education to the Navajo youth). The sample frame of students would consist of all youths living on the reservation from age 5 to 18. This affords a rich opportunity to conduct a study of the choices open to Navajo parents and children and the apparent consequences of these choices. This study could not be conducted if the LEA as primary sample unit concept were adhered to rigidly.

TABLE 1

Apache County School Districts Lying within the Navajo Indian Reservation

(1976/77 Data)

District	Number of Schools	American Indians	Total	LES/NES	ESL
Chinle	10	3990	4162	3839	1849
Ganado	1	1554	1631	932	877
Puerco	1	578	705	578	0
Window Rock	4	2419	2593	681	676

Grade Range of Students

Most respondents agreed that grades K-12 be included at the very least. Most would include preschool bilingual programs as well. This is feasible for the Instructional Features Study although it might increase costs significantly. Note that one such preschool (Lincoln Center, Oakland, CA) was included in the respondent sample for this field verification.

A number of respondents also called for extension into post-secondary years. We would not recommend that the study be extended in this way since the educational issues are quite different from those in K-12. Such a study might better be sponsored by HEW groups primarily concerned with postsecondary or adult education.

Sample Frame of Students

The initial recommendation was to include all language minority students who live in the PSU in the sample frame. The appropriateness of this suggestion was supported in informal conversations held on site. In particular, the Coordinator of Asian Languages Programs in Los Angeles expressed concern for students of Asian descent who were relatively isolated from Asian communities. Sometimes these students are offered inferior services because they make up such a small fraction of the schools that they attend. Vietnamese students, for example, have sometimes been assigned to Spanish bilingual programs. The sample of students must be appropriately constructed to include isolated minority students if the study is to be concerned with such problems.

However, our stress on language minority students now seems questionable. About two-thirds of the respondents stated that "bilingual education was for everyone," and cited, in particular, Anglo children who wished to learn a second language. In fact many respondents felt that bilingual education should be the mainstream form of education in certain areas of high concentration of non English-speaking students. This is easy to support for such areas as Dade County, where concentrations of Spanish-speaking families are so large that the local economy and culture are fully bilingual. Anglo students in these areas need Spanish to cope with their environments; they would be a useful addition to the sample frame, at least for such areas.

Institutions to be Included

Respondents promoted the widest possible variety of program types for the study, including churches, Chinese schools, after-school classes, etc. This was in response to open ended questions (i.e., the answers were not prompted by offering such organizations categorically). The field verification thus unambiguously supported the design recommendation made in Planning Paper 4; that an extremely wide variety of language resources be included in the study.

Choice of Large Cities as Sites

It is common knowledge in contract research corporations such as AAI and its competitors that certain large cities are generally to be avoided as research sites. Two cities often shunned for research are New York City and Los Angeles. This reluctance to deal with large city school systems is understandable given problems that have been encountered in the past. Because of their diversity, their complexity and the number of groups (politicians, parents, teachers), there are many barriers to data collection and, especially, delays. These problems increase the costs of studies and may endanger success of the studies. We were surprised to hear, however (in Los Angeles), that the cities themselves are aware of this problem. One respondent was quite explicit in her belief that Los Angeles was understudied as a result. In both New York and Los Angeles we found considerable desire for a study. Our conclusion was that the Instructional Features Study ought not to shun large sites, especially since so may language minority students are part of the urban mainstream. They should be selected with the realization that they are likely to require considerable additional expenditure of study resources, and that the school systems will wish to be involved in the study design. This may make implementation of a study that is uniform across sites difficult.

4.3 Data Collection

The plans presented in Planning Papers 3 and 4 emphasized the following sources of data:

- Interviews (parents, students, teachers);
- Questionnaires;
- Direct observation;
- Language proficiency tests;
- Academic performance tests;
- Affective tests;
- Case histories; and
- Informal anthropological/ethnographic investigation.

There is no apparent problem with any of these techniques, with proper explanation, except for the three forms of tests. Since most of the test battery is to be developed in the first year of the study and not administered until the second, no immediate problem is posed except for language proficiency tests--which were recommended for the first study year. The field verification study showed that there is hostility to any form of standardized tests, including language proficiency tests. Since these appear to be essential to the study (academic performance tests could be dispensed with if necessary), a definite problem is posed. Assurances of anonymity, delay of testing until late in the year, assurances of non-evaluative use of test scores and making the importance of language tests clear may all help to obtain acceptance of these tests. In certain sites, locally given tests could be used--these are required both in New York and California as part of rather heavy existing test burdens.

4.4 Suggested Approach to LEAs and Schools

It became apparent during the field verification that it is possible to obtain the cooperation of any of the LEAs surveyed, provided that they are approached in an appropriate manner. The points mentioned as important to the LEAs were nearly constant from site to site, as Section 3.5 demonstrates. The salient points are:

1) Respect for administrative protocol of each educational organization. Contacts should generally begin with the research and evaluation office or the BE office, proceed to the superintendent's office, and go from there to the schools and the parents.

2) A prospectus of the study that presents the design clearly should be prepared and used to help obtain cooperation. There are no points of the recommended study design that are abhorent to practitioners. A full explanation of the study will be a strong selling point because of the congruence of the design and what practitioners and administrators believe.

3) At all levels, the schools are concerned with financial burden, increased work load, and disruption of the educational process. These effects can be minimized or eliminated as follows. First, the burdens to be imposed by the study should be made very precise so that the schools know exactly what is expected of them. Second, any financial burdens should be eliminated by direct payments to the schools. Third, teachers who put in additional hours to help the study should be paid at union rates for these hours. Last, the measurement and observation schedule must be constructed well in advance so that there is minimum disruption of the school's own schedules.

4) The benefits to be made available by the study should be very clearly stated. These benefits include potential improvement of bilingual education instruction and better education for bilingual students. This benefit is important to people and should be presented, but it is also somewhat vague. People are more interested in sure benefits that affect them directly. At the LEA level, promotion and publicity for the district and its BE program are important to districts -- both to improve community relations and to improve prospects for continued or increased funding. Sharing of study results as they become available may be useful to districts in its own evaluations. Results may also help to avoid suspicions that the study is biased, or even hostile, to BE.

   Further tangible benefits should be considered. One possibility is to provide gifts of equipment or books to schools or classrooms. Another is to hire community personnel (perhaps

substitute teachers) familiar with the school to serve as on-site data collection personnel. These persons could have offices in the school or LEA and contribute to reducing the school's existing paper work burden, as well as to serve the Bilingual Features Study. This would result in an overall lessening of imposed burden on the LEA and schools.

5) The cooperation of parents must also be secured. This may be done through the schools, through PACs, and through brochures, press releases and public meetings. Public education is the key to success since the study, in fact, serves the best interests of parents. Opinions of parents should be solicited and considered seriously in the detailed study design.

4.5 Implications for Identification of On-Site Staff

The data collection schedules recommended in Planning Paper 4 include extensive in-classroom observation, collection of questionnaires, administration of interviews, collection of student case histories and informal investigations throughout the community. If AAI recommendations are followed, there will be approximately eight to sixteen sites in eight language/geographical strata. It was determined in the field verification that: (1) observers should be of the same ethnic background as the majority of students observed; (2) they should know the students' languages and, preferably, be of the students' community; (3) observations must be extended over some period of time to achieve generalizability and minimize behavior reactivity; (4) feedback and explanations should be routinely provided; (5) there is resentment against researchers who spend only short periods of time on-site, but nevertheless offer sometimes damaging evaluations--they appear to take something from the community, but not to give anything in exchange; and (6) long lead times may be required to obtain full cooperation with a research study.

These considerations point directly to a design that includes a full-time on-site research staff in each site. The site team should include persons with anthropological/ethnographic and educational research backgrounds who know the relevant languages. Although these would preferably be from the community, this is not absolutely required. It has been observed by AAI staff that sympathetic on-site researchers will be accepted by the community after their commitment and interest has been proved over a period of time. The site staff would be focal persons who not only organize data collection, but act as ombudsmen between home study staff and people from the schools and

the community. They would also be responsible for administering the part-time staff of teachers, parents and other local study participants.

If this recommendation is adopted by NIE, it would point towards a study involving only a few sites--to keep the study within resources available and to keep it manageable. In fact, we recommend that only eight sites, one from each language/geographical stratum, be selected. If two full-time, on-site staff were hired for each site, the on-site staff would consume almost half of anticipated study resources. It would be problematic for the study as a whole if the on-site component were much larger than this.

APPENDIX 1

DADE COUNTY FIELD VERIFICATION REPORT

FELICIA D. GIL

Description of the Dade County Community

Dade County is an urban area composed of 27 different municipalities and townships. It has approximately one and a half million citizens reflecting three major ethnic groups: White non-Hispanic which constitute approximately one-third of the population, Black non-Hispanic which constitute approximately one-third of the population, and Cuban and other Hispanic which constitute the remaining one third of the population.

Most of the Cuban exiles in the United States live in Dade County, where there are more than half a million in total. Cubans are a major economic force in the County, and they can be found in every sector. Other Hispanics in Dade County are relatively few in number and include primarily Puerto Ricans and Mexican-Americans. Other non-English language origin groups include Russian, Italian, Hebrew, Portuguese, Indochinese, Arabic, Mandarin, and Cantonese speakers.

The two major languages spoken in Dade County are English and Spanish. Dade County has been declared a bilingual county basically for political as well as economic reasons. Millions of tourists from Latin America spend millions of dollars every year in Miami, which makes it most important that many of the local citizens speak Spanish. Tourism is one of the largest sources of income for the County.

Description of the Dade County School System

The Dade County Public Schools has 226,000 students in membership, of which 72,000 are Hispanics. Of the total, approximately 13,000 are limited in their command of English, including some 11,500 Cubans and other Hispanics, 800 Haitians, and 700 speakers of diverse other languages. The school district is divided administratively into four areas: North, North Central, South Central, and South. There is also a central administrative office. There are approximately 262 schools, of which 142 are elementary, 60 junior high, and 40 senior high including various alternative schools. There are approximately 135 elementary schools and 10 secondary schools providing bilingual instruction. All elementary schools offer Spanish as a language, and all regular junior and senior high schools offer Spanish and other languages.

Description of Dade County's Bilingual Programs

Bilingual Education/Foreign Languages in Dade County has five components:

ESOL	English for Speakers of Other Languages
Spanish-S	Spanish for Spanish Speakers
Spanish SL	Elementary Spanish as a Second Language
BCC	Bilingual Curriculum Content (Science, Math, etc.)
Secondary FL	Secondary Foreign Languages.

Bilingual Education is delivered through one or the other of two types of organizations: the Transitional Bilingual Basic Skills (TBBS) organization, and the

Bilingual School Organization, of the maintenance type. In addition, there is a language maintenance program in every school with Hispanic students in Dade County designed to develop literacy and other communication skills in Spanish as a home language, and there is a program of Spanish as a second/foreign language countywide for students of non-Hispanic origin which begins in grade 4.

Dade County is providing native language instruction in other languages besides Spanish which have twenty or more students of limited English proficiency. including:

Haitian Creole	Russian	Vietnamese
French	Laotian	Hindi
Hebrew	Arabic	Portuguese
Mandarin	Cantonese	

Dade County's bilingual programs operate with four types of funding:

Cuban Refugee Assistance
Title VII Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA-Bilingual)
Title VII Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Basic
Local funding

The Title VII funds, both ESAA and ESEA, are very limited, serving only a small percentage of the students. The majority of the bilingual services are provided through Cuban Refugee Assistance funds.

There is a County consultant for Bilingual Education/Foreign Languages, and a County coordinator for Bilingual Education. The former is responsible administratively for all bilingual education and foreign language programs, while the latter is immediately responsible for the program of English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) and the six maintenance (BISO) schools.

Description of the Procedure Used in Identifying Respondents

The respondents were selected from schools and/or communities where there is a high concentration of Spanish speakers, the majority being of Cuban origin with some Puerto Ricans. In addition, some were included to reflect the Haitian Creole speaking community. All the persons interviewed are knowledgeable of the bilingual programs in Dade County and are working in the programs and/or have children attending them.

In total, 28 persons were interviewed: the two administrators of bilingual programs within the district, three school principals, nine teachers, nine teacher aides and/or teacher assistants, and five parents.

Make-Up of the Group

The consultant for Bilingual Education/Foreign Languages is White non-Hispanic, Spanish/English bilingual, and a pioneer in the bilingual education movement in the United States. He spent part of his professional life in Puerto Rico, and has been with the Dade County Public Schools fourteen years. He is the author/co-author of a number of textbooks used in bilingual programs as well as articles on bilingual education.

The coordinator for bilingual education is Cuban, Spanish/English bilingual, and the only bilingual member of the Research Committee which reviews and approves all research to be done in Dade County. She has been a member of the National Advisory Council for Bilingual Education and has been with the Dade County Public Schools for seventeen years.

The principals reflect three ethnic groups, one being non-Hispanic White, one being Puerto Rican, and one being Cuban. Two of them are elementary school principals and one is a junior high school principal. Two of the schools are in areas with high concentrations of Cuban origin students, and one is in an area with a high concentration of Puerto Rican students. One is the co-author of a book on bilingual education and the author of several articles in this field, and was the principal of a bilingual school. Another was the project director of a Title VII materials development center, and the third was assistant principal of a bilingual school. All three are Spanish/English bilingual and have bilingual programs in their schools. They are very supportive of and knowledgeable in the field of bilingual education.

The teachers reflect three ethnic groups, seven being of Cuban origin, one being Haitian, and one being Spanish. Eight are Spanish/English bilingual, and one is trilingual (Haitian Creole/French/English). Two of them are resource teachers and seven are teaching in schools with bilingual programs. Among the group are representatives of all the bilingual programs and components in Dade County: English for Speakers of Other Languages, Spanish as a Second Language, Bilingual Curriculum Content in the transitional bilingual program and in the maintenance program. The schools where they work are located in communities throughout the district and represent all socio-economic levels and ethnic make-ups. They were very supportive of bilingual education programs.

The Teacher Aides/Teacher Assistants are all Cubans, the majority holding a valid teaching certificate in Florida but unable to find positions as teachers. The majority are Spanish/English bilingual, but their English is very limited. They work in schools representing all the bilingual components and programs of the Dade County Public Schools, all socio-economic levels, and all ethnic make-ups. One of the teacher assistants is also the chairperson of the Advisory Committee for the Title VII project. All were very supportive of bilingual education programs.

Parents and Community Representatives are all of Cuban origin, the majority being limited in their command of English. Among them are the chairperson of the Districtwide Parent Advisory Council and ESAA Parent Advisory Council, and a P.T.A. president. Some of them have children of limited English proficiency, some have children in bilingual schools, others have children in the language maintenance program, and one has a child in the learning disability program. They represent different socio-economic and cultural levels, and are from communities with diverse ethnic make-ups. They were all supportive of bilingual education programs.

In general, the respondants represent all grade levels, all socio-economic levels, all bilingual program components, and all community make-ups in Dade County.

Description of People's Reaction

For the most part the interviews were carried out in the respondent's home. Most of them felt better communicating in their native language - Spanish, therefore the interviewer translated the questions and later translated the responses back to English.

All the participants were willing to share their points of view and their ideas and even try to answer when they were not sure. Thus there were not very many "I don't know" answers. In general, everyone felt that it would be a good idea to have more research in bilingual education if the research was to be specific enough to give solutions to problems leading to the improvement of education of children.

Participants also agreed that the research, if it was to be carried out, should be done with minimum disturbance of the educational process and that all resources required should be provided by the researchers.

APPENDIX 2

NEW YORK CITY FIELD VERIFICATION REPORT

S. B. CERVENKA

JILL RIPS

CARMEN PEREZ DELGADO

1. Introduction

This report is submitted to ABT ASSOCIATES INC., as part of an effort to test the feasibility of conducting a possible future nationwide bilingual education study for the National Institute of Education. This report deals with that portion of the study which was conducted in a selected New York City Community School District, and focuses on the English/Spanish bilingual programs in that district and two high schools, and the investigation team's experiences in conducting a study.

The report is arranged as follows: a description of the study site, including an overview of the New York City Public School System and a description of the selected Community School District; a chronology of the study itself; description of the respondent population, i.e., positions, ethnicity and language dominance; description of the interviews and a final section of conclusions derived from the experiences of the investigation team and recommendations for the conduct of a possible future study.

In order to preserve the anonymity of respondents, no identification will be made of the target district other than geographic location and the nature of the population. It is unavoidable that even this limited information will result in the identification of a few respondents; also unavoidable is the identification of at least one LEA official interviewed. The author of this report will, however, go to all reasonable lengths to preserve the confidentiality of individual responses to interview questions.

The investigation team wishes to express their most sincere thanks to the officials of the New York City Board of Education and the Local Community School District and the District and High School personnel who were involved in this effort, for their patience, assistance and cooperation. We hope that the results of this study and any future studies which ensue will repay them for their generous and enthusiastic support.

2. The Study Site

2.1 New York City

New York City, the largest city in the United States, contains over 41 percent of the population of New York State, in five boroughs covering an area of 300 square miles. Latest available population estimates put the population of New York City at 7,149,300*, and some authorities add to this figure an additional 1 million undocumented workers. New York City is unique in this country, perhaps in the world, in the enormous ethnic, linguistic, social and cultural variety of its inhabitants. By far the largest linguistic minority are Hispanics, of whom there are an estimated 1.5 million. Ninety-eight percent of the Hispanic population of New York State lives in the New York Metropolitan Area, 95 percent in the City itself. Most of these are bilingual in English and Spanish to varying degrees; however, within the Hispanic population there are large numbers of Speakers with Limited English Proficiency and Monolingual Spanish Speakers. The exact numbers or percentages of Hispanics who fall within these two categories are unknown**; however, these individuals represent an unquestionably significant factor in the educational, cultural, economic and political life of the City.

2.2 The New York City Public School System

The New York City Public School System provides intruction for about 1 million children from pre-kindergarten through high school, and in special schools and classes. The operation and maintenance of school services require facilities in 1,116 buildings; a staff of 95,000, of whom some 54,000 are teachers, and a total annual expenditure of some $2.6 billion.***

---

*City of New York, Bureau of Census, Data Use Service population estimates for 1978 (latest available data).

**There are no statistics on the numbers of Monolingual Spanish Speakers or Hispanics of Limited English Proficiency in New York City. Although the identification of these groups is an important priority for the Hispanic community, no definitive research has been possible to date. Even ASPIRA has no estimates of the numbers in these groups.

***New York City Board of Education, The Chancellor's Annual Report, 1978-1979.

Under the City's decentralized community school district system, the operation and control of the public schools are shared by a citywide Board of Education and 32 community school boards. The City Board of Education has jurisdiction over high schools, special schools and classes, and certain other citywide operations. The community boards control the elementary and junior high-intermediate schools in their respective districts, subject to citywide policies established by the City Board in consultation with the community boards.

2.3 Student Population

New York City has 1,000,143 students enrolled in 635 elementary schools, 179 junior high-intermediate schools, 67 special education schools, 77 academic high schools, 22 vocational high schools and 15 independent alternative high schools. Some 294,792--or 29.5%--of the student population are Hispanic; of these 61,570 are enrolled in bilingual education programs. Also among the some 78,000 students enrolled in over 500 schools offering bilingual programs are speakers of Chinese, Italian French/Haitian, Creole, Greek, Russian, Korean, Hebrew, Yiddish, Arabic and others.*

2.4 The Community School District

The New York City Community School District chosen as the site for this study is located in East Harlem or "El Barrio." The district contains 19 elementary schools and 3 junior high-intermediate schools; in addition there are 6 non-public schools who share in, and benefit from, the special program services offered by the district. There are bilingual education programs in 9 district elementary schools, 2 junior high-intermediate schools and 1 nonpublic school. There are 18 special district-wide funded projects, 4 of which are funded by ESEA Title VII; however, most projects have bilingual components and/or participation by bilingual students. There are 6 bilingual projects, including a bilingual bicultural

---

*Statistics from the New York City Board of Education Office of Educational Statistics (1978 school census) and the NYC Board of Education Office of Bilingual Education (See Appendices B, C, D and E).

art school, an elementary bilingual bicultural minischool, a junior high level bilingual bicultural minischool, a bilingual education career awareness project, a project for the bilingual learning disabled and a bilingual education demonstration project. There are also 14 alternative schools, 3 of which are bilingual or have bilingual components.

The district serves 12,615 students, 7,694 of whom are Hispanic;* these latter are approximately 20% English-dominant and 80% Spanish-dominant, and virtually all attend bilingual programs, either by parental request or because they are mandated to do so by the ASPIRA Consent Decree. Most of the English-dominant students are Puerto Rican or of other hispanic origin and are Spanish-speaking, but with varying degrees of proficiency. The district enrolls two distinct groups of "Spanish-dominant" students: one is comprised of Spanish-speaking children who are clearly Spanish-dominant in all language skills and in all domains of language use (e.g., home vs. school, academic study vs. social interaction with peers, speaking-understanding vs. reading and writing, etc.) These students tend to be fairly recent arrivals from Spanish-speaking countries, Puerto Rico and other areas. The second group is made up of students who appear dominant in Spanish in some language skills and in some domains of language use, and dominant in English in others. These students are mostly natives of the New York City area or long time residents. Some of these students have had prior schooling principally in programs having only all-English-speaking classrooms, although their home language is Spanish. Most of this category of students are mandated to be in programs of bilingual instruction by the ASPIRA Consent Decree.

The philosophy of the bilingual programs in the district is one of "maintenance" of "enrichment," i.e., students are given instruction in their dominant language in subject area while English is introduced, but dominant language instruction is continued even after the child has mastered English. The goal is to create bilingual, biliterate, bicultural individuals who

*These student population figures are current as of February 12, 1980.

can function equally well in either language or culture. The alternate, and often opposing, philosophy, i.e., "transitional" or "compensatory" or sometimes "remedial," involves instruction in the student's native language accompanied by intensive ESL instruction until such time as he has mastered English well enough to be "mainstreamed" into the monolingual classroom.

2.5 The High School

New York City high schools are not zoned or districted as in most areas of the country. After completion of junior high or intermediate school a student applies to the high school(s) of his choice and may attend any school which accepts him. Most graduates of the target district's junior high-intermediate schools attend one of two high schools located within, or very close to the district's geographical boundaries. Because it was not possible to arrange to conduct the study in either of these schools, the investigation team chose a bilingual high school in another borough. The choice was arbitrary in that the investigators chose a bilingual high school, but on the other hand it was not totally so in that district students do apply to and attend the high school selected.

The bilingual high school chosen is located in the South Bronx in a predominantly Hispanic neighborhood. Its student population is small in comparison with most NYC high schools--only 970. Virtually all of its students are Hispanic and Spanish-dominant or bilingual in English and Spanish. The school draws, from throughout the City, students who wish to continue their education in a bilingual setting or who are mandated to do so under the ASPIRA Consent Decree. It is an academic high school. Its educational philosophy is bilingual, biliterate, bicultural educational maintenance and enrichment.

2.6 The Vocational High School

As is the case for academic high schools, vocational and technical high schools in New York City draw students on a citywide basis. The vocational high school chosen for this study is located on Manhattan's West Side and has a student population of 2,500. Of these 101 are enrolled

in a self-contained ESL/bilingual minischool. (Statistics on the numbers of ethnic Hispanics in the school were not available.) Although the school is officially a vocational-technical high school, it also has an academic program.

Admittance criteria depend upon the program which the student wishes to enter. The school offers programs in food and restaurant professions, maritime, automotive, aviation, and management programs in these fields. Students must pass a placement or screening test in order to enter these programs. Because the school offers not only vocation and technical courses, but also academic ones, many students go on to colleges and universities after graduation. The school enrolls several students from the selected community school district each year, especially in the field of aviation.

The educational philosophy is that of "transitional" bilingual education. Students are taught subject matter with an ESL approach, the aim being to make them functional in English. Only those with insufficient skills in English to handle the curriculum in that language are taught by a bilingual approach. After students have mastered English they pursue the school's standard curriculum in monolingual classes. The school's philosophy is that the particular population who choose the type of instruction offered in the school's programs will enter the English-speaking workplace to go on to English-medium colleges and universities.

3. The Investigation Team

The team which carried out this study consisted of three investigators: The Principal On-Site Investigator (PI) is a New York based consultant in educational evaluation and research who has conducted several evaluation studies of ESEA Title VII programs in the target district. The Second Investigator (I2) has extensive experience in interviewing and research, having been a census enumerator, and investigator for prisoner civil rights infractions, a paralegal and a research associate involved in the evaluation of bilingual programs in the target district. At present (I2) is engaged in graduate studies in medical anthropology. The Third Investigator (I3) is a psychological consultant who has worked with a bilingual learning disabilities program in the target district. All three investigators are experienced researchers and interviewers. All three are bilingual in English and Spanish; PI and I2 speak Spanish as a second language, and I3 is a native Puerto Rican. PI and I2 are originally from the Southwest; I3 is a native New Yorker. All three are known in the target district and considered as "part of the larger bilingual community."

3.1 Team Strategy for Conducting Study

Given the special attributes of each team member, the following strategy was adopted: PI would solicit respondents and make appointments by telephone; she would also interview LEA and District Office personnel. I3 would use her knowledge of the instructional personnel and parents to get non-scheduled interviews. I2 would serve as backup for PI and I3, conducting interviews as appointments were made. It was agreed that I3 would interview any monolingual Spanish-speakers or Spanish-dominant respondents who could more easily be interviewed in Spanish, as she was the native-Spanish-speaker of the group. This strategy, if implemented as planned, would have meant that PI concentrated on administrative personnel, I2 on teachers and program directors, and I3 on parents and paraprofessionals. Circumstances prevented us from following this strategy.

4. The Study

4.1 Chronology of the Study

The team conducted 33 interviews over a period of 8 school days. As indicated above, the main problems were recruiting respondents and scheduling interviews. The PI acted to the extent possible on the advice of the District Director of Bilingual Programs and tried to make contact through District Office personnel. Although this is an excellent idea, in practice there are limits to the impositions one can make on busy administrators within any given period of time.

4.2 Problems Encountered in Conducting Study

As stated above, the main problem encountered by the evaluation team was time. Teachers, administrators, and even parents were for the most part unwilling and/or unable to be interviewed at any time other than during school hours. This meant arranging interviews around very tight schedules. Although the investigation team offered to meet with respondents anytime and anywhere, in 32 out of 33 instances, respondents requested that interviews be conducted at school on school time, or in the District or other offices on work time. This was the function of the busy schedules of the respondents and the large amount of time necessary for commuting in the New York City area, even within the city itself.

Precious time was almost lost because of the Principal Investigator's misunderstanding of the process for obtaining permission for the study. One HS principal attempted to get clearance for the study in his school, however granted interviews without their permission. The other HS principal did not seem to feel the need to contact the Div. of HS's. The LEA representative at the Central Board asked the PI if she had cleared the study with the Office of Educational Evaluation. Although the PI answered that she had not, the interview was granted anyway. Near the end of the study, the PI decided to contact the Office of Educational Evaluation and try to get information about the procedure for conducting future studies; an interview with the

proper official in that office would have been a valuable addition to the study. However, the PI was never able to make contact with an official in the OEE.

A major problem in conducting any study in the NYC Public School system is that it is difficult to discover who to obtain information from and what procedures to follow.

The target district has been the focus of many studies over the past several years. Many teachers, paraprofessionals and administrators view this attention in a very positive manner. Others have become hostile to, and wary of, being included in research and observation. Respondents commonly felt that field researchers should be familiar with bilingual education.

That the interviewers were from the "bilingual community" and known in the district facilitated their work. It may have also had a slightly negative effect on some of the respondents. Both the PI and I3 felt that some respondents saw them as authority figures or representatives of the district administration, and therefore felt somewhat threatened by the interview. I3 felt that some paraprofessionals feared that they might jeopardize their jobs if they expressed their opinions.

The PI believes that because she is not easily identified as bilingual, respondents could more easily express antibilingual education feelings.

Given the complexity of the New York School System, the Central Board of Education and the Community School District, it has been suggested that NYC simply be excluded from any national study of bilingual education. Given the large numbers, richness and variety of bilingual programs in NYC the PI believes that NYC should be included.

5. The Interview Experience

5.1 Identification of Respondents

To the extent possible the investigation team tried to follow closely the categories and spread of respondents outlined in study documents and specified by the Deputy Project Director. At the beginning of the study the PI elicited a list of appropriate respondents from the District Director of Bilingual Programs. Information on high schools and vocational schools was obtained from the guidance counselor at a district junior high-intermediate school. It was suggested that the Deputy Director of Bilingual Programs could supply important information on parents, but this individual was not available for consultation during the time of the study. In addition to the above, the investigation team used their own knowledge of the NYC Board of Education, the District and the community. Roughly one-third of the respondent categories corresponded to only one available individual per category. The other two-thirds respondent categories were broad enough that the interviewers had a choise of several available respondents.

5.2 Setting Up Interviews

Availability and time constraints posed problems. Most respondents expressed willingness to be interviewed; however, very few seemed able to do so on very short notice. Many respondents in the administrative categories were approached through secretaries and/or assistants. It was necessary to explain the study at length to each of these; at times their cooperation was the deciding factor in whether or not the interview was granted. Appointments were facilitated when District Office personnel made the initial contact with respondents. As happens in all studies, at times appointments were broken and calls were not returned. The only two outright refusals came from principals. In general principals were the least enthusiastic participants. The scheduling and keeping of appointments was most difficult with parents and paraprofessionals.

5.3 The Interviews

All interviews were conducted in schools and District or Board of Ed. offices, except in the case of one community representative who was interviewed in his office at a local hospital. All but one interview was

conducted, or at least begun, during school or working hours. Interviews were conducted in private, but invariably with many interruptions.

Three "courtesy" interviews were granted; however, these resulted in valuable information so that they turned out not to be wasted time after all. In two instances respondents were visibly angry that they had not been selected for participation in the study; in one of these instances the respondent had been told by a District administrator that she would be interviewed, but the interviewers were not aware of this.

Most respondents requested information about the firm conducting the survey which the interviewers could not supply, e.g., who are the principals in the company, how long has it been in business. Only the PI had this information because she was the only interviewer who had read the project proposal. Respondents all requested that they receive copies of the final report to NIE. The PI will request this information from NIE and distribute it to the participants.

Almost all respondents were extremely concerned about the confidentiality of the interviews. Many felt that they were expressing opinions that would not be popular with the District or Central Board. Interviewers had to reassure respondents constantly throughout the interviews that responses would be held in strictest confidence.

Most respondents expressed to the interviewers that they felt that their participation in the study was important and that the study would yield valuable information.

Most respondents answered questions regarding the best ways to approach various people in the same way: "Explain purposes and methods and importance of study." Interviewers would like to note that target district has been the subject of many studies, and people take pride in their cooperativeness, even though they may express irritation at being requested to perform beyond their already heavy workload.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 Conclusions

As to the feasibility of conducting the larger study in the target district, one could expect the support of the bilingual education establishment, but care should be taken to avoid the culturally biased assumptions and broad generalizations which have characterized previous studies. Perhaps an ethnographic approach would be the best, especially considering the target district's negative attitudes toward, and suspicions of, standardized tests.

An important bit of information uncovered by this investigation is that the New York City Board of Education is putting into effect a computerized system for storing students records--Metrolab. If this system is operational by the time the study begins, it will greatly facilitate the retrieval of student records.

Also useful in the discovery that the Central Board's Office of Bilingual Education is about to implement an overall evaluation plan, and that any studies of bilingual education programs in New York City School System must be cleared by that office, as well as by the Office of Educational Evaluation. In order to receive permission to conduct a study of bilingual education in the New York City School System, the sponsoring agency or firm conducting the study will have to submit its study design to the Office of Bilingual Education and that design must fit into, correspond with, complement, and not duplicate other elements in the Office of Bilingual Education's overall research plan. Details of requirements for studies will be available from the Director of Bilingual Programs, New York City Board of Education, as soon as the plan is completed and put into effect--probably by the end of the 1979-1980 school year.

The study clearly showed that the best way to elicit support and cooperation from the community, the Local Education Agency, parents, school administrators, teachers and paraprofessionals can be summed up in one word: Explain.

Although future studies of bilingual education in New York City will come under considerably more scrutiny and have to meet stricter standards and requirements than has been the case heretofore, I believe that a study of bilingual instructional features is feasible in the New York City Area.

6.2 Recommendations

1. That the Director of Bilingual Programs for the New York City Board of Education be contacted to ascertain the requirements for research designs for bilingual education in New York City.

2. That sufficient time be allowed in the preparation of future protocols to allow for translation and translation validation.

3. That sufficient lead time be allowed for research efforts. Because of the organizational complexity and the slowness of bureaucratic responses in New York, this site requires considerably more lead time than might be the case for other areas.

4. That any field effort in New York City, or which is contracted to individual consultants in any area, allow in its budget a clerical or secretarial position. Such a person could handle the routine making of appointments and coordination of investigators at considerably less cost than a research consultant.

5. That teams for field studies in bilingual education be composed of individuals with different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds and assignments be made on the basis of acceptability to the identified respondent. In our case it was invaluable that the investigators were considered to be a part of the "bilingual community." It was also quite valuable in one case that the investigator was not easily identified as bilingual.

6. That study schedules be coordinated with the school calendars to be sure that the study does not conflict with major school activities or holidays.

APPENDIX 3

OAKLAND FIELD VERIFICATION REPORT

RODGER G. LUM

Overall, the field verification study at the Oakland study site went smoothly, though more time for information gathering would have been desirable. This effort permitted us to gather general information about feasibility of formal evaluative studies in Oakland Unified Public Schools, especially on Chinese bilingual education programs.

SPECIFIC PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED DURING FIELD VERIFICATION

A variety of problems occurred in terms of process and interview questions. Here are the most salient problems based on interview experiences of three interviewers (including myself):

1. Scheduling problems occurred with teachers, aides, principals, and other stakeholders in bilingual education. This problem was accentuated by the timing of the verification effort (this is in addition to normal problems encountered with busy teachers and principals). Specifically, this study was conducted just prior to and during Chinese Lunar New Year (commencing on February 15) and Washington's Birthday holiday. School level activities were at a furious pace since teachers and principals were attempting to prepare their Chinese bilingual programs for specific lesson plans, cultural events, and classroom presentations and exhibits. As such, interview respondents were hard-pressed to grant us time.

Another scheduling problem was the lack of time for respondents to schedule in interviews. We basically had less than one working week to plan about 30 interviews. At times we felt this presented a problem in terms of adequately briefing those in positions of denying or approving access to instructors, community representatives, and parents.

2. Some participants were concerned about doing another "study." They felt that they have been evaluated and researched up to their ears by the School District, state educators/auditors, and other bilingual education evaluators. In view of the history of bilingual education research in California and the Bay Area in particular, their concerns were not unfounded. One informant also told us that Oakland actually has been studied more often than San Francisco in terms of bilingual education. Dynamically, S.F. public schools were so fed up with outside research that they began referring researchers to Oakland (known as "passing the buck").

GENERAL FINDINGS

1. Most respondents felt that bilingual education should be defined as language instruction with the intent of developing second language fluency (in the English language) and as a means of facilitating learning in traditional content areas such as math, history, etc., and cultural background values and practices.

2. The goals and objectives of bilingual education were related to definitions. More specifically, respondents typically wanted bilingual education to provide second language training

in order that students may compete on equal footing with English-speaking children; as means of enabling the maintenance and appreciation of their mother culture as well as other cultures; as means of enhancing ethnic pride and self-respect, self-esteem, and positive self-concept; and as a way of educating and sensitizing all children in a multi-ethnic society.

3. There was uniform agreement that bilingual education has had positive effects on academic achievement, self-esteem, student motivation and participation in classrooms, parent involvement, and inter-racial relations at the school level. Some participants recommended longitudinal or follow-up studies of bilingual education children from K-12, with the intention of demonstrating measurable impact on college level performance. There was some concern about the feasibility of such a study, particularly in terms of cost, time and the fact that bilingual education in its present form has not been around that long in California.

A serious concern was raised by several administrators who felt bilingual education programs also have negative trade-offs. They mentioned Chinese children who may feel isolated from kids in the regular classrooms or who may experience cultural and ethnic shock upon entering high school where there generally are no bilingual programs.

4. Most respondents felt that both Title VII and other forms of bilingual education (at churches, Children's Centers, etc.) should be included in instructional features studies. It was felt that this approach will allow us to identify as many effective forms of bilingual education as possible.

5. Features or aspects of bilingual education deserving closer attention include examination of linkage between self-esteem and bilingual education, effects of specific learning models upon academic achievement and cultural maintenance, and the relationship between learning/teaching philosophy or direction of bilingual education and consequences for children.

6. Respondents would not mind participating in a formal instructional features study as long as they were given ample time to consider the study objectives, benefits, and design.

7. There was no clear trend in terms of which method is preferred. Various respondents considered the trade-offs of some general approaches (e.g., interviews vs. questionnaires).

8. Respondents were fairly evenly divided in terms of whether the observer or researcher had to be from the community. Basically, respondents felt that a sensitive, unbiased person could do a creditable job; however, a minority person from the community was preferred.

9. Student files contain sufficient information for some kind of evaluative study to be done. However, they appear

to lack specificity for a detailed instructional features study. There would have to be some modification of the information gathering process in order to provide better fit with such a proposed study.

10. Access to student files is relatively easy, though permission must be obtained from the on-site principal or program director. Information is generally updated each semester for academic performance and progress, though language and bilingual assessments are done less frequenlty.

11. Respondents did not care for standardized testing, particularly in areas involving verbal or literary ability in English. They considered non-verbal and mathematical assessments more accurate indicators of student achievement and ability.

12. Finally, it appears feasible to conduct an instructional features study in Oakland Public Schools (particularly with Chinese bilingual programs). The Lincoln Children's Center, though not under the jurisdiction of OPS, would be very cooperative. LCC is a widely recognized preschool program for Chinese immigrant and LES children.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. I would highly recommend a future study site be selected in Oakland.

2. Ample time should be given to secure permission/approval from the Superintendent of Oakland Public Schools (Dr. Ruth Love), Director of Research, Director of the Office of Bilingual Education in OPS (Dr. Carlos Saavedra), Director of Chinese Bilingual Programs in OPS (Mrs. Josephine Lee), and various on-site school or program principals. With their approval, consent from teachers should be relatively easy. Nevertheless, withcut such formal approval, various teachers have indicated their willingness to participate.

3. All survey or research forms should be circulated to the Advisory Committee and relevant project staff members for review and comments.

4. For the Chinese bilingual programs, no project should be initiated prior to or during Chinese Lunar New Year.

5. Study participants need not be paid for their participation, unless their involvement is done on their own time. Serious consideration should be given to reimbursing parents for their help. Money or a simple gift in appreciation for their time may help overcome some of their resistances. More importantly, it is a Chinese custom to bring food gifts to people you visit. This type of thoughtfulness is culturally appropriate and touching in its own right.

6. Classroom observers should be from the community and reflective of classroom ethnic and cultural make-up. Observers should blend into the classroom at least several days before formal observation and recording to familiarize students and teachers.

7. Since Lincoln Elementary School in Oakland is the only full bilingual education program in OPS, more time and effort must be spent with the teachers to overcome their objections and resistances. The school principal was amenable, however.

8. Preliminary planning of the research design by the contractor might be done in collaboration with the Director of Research and the Coordinator of an area's Chinese bilingual programs in order to maximize vested interests and commitment to successful and reliable completion of the study. This may involve taking them on as Special Technical Consultants on-site (this would minimize high consultant costs of flying both of them to the contractor's headquarters). The Advisory Committee and Project staff would assume primary responsibility for study design and questionnaire/interview development.

9. Chinese bilingual education students at both school and community programs should be included in an instructional features study. The same argument should be made for Title VII and non-Title VII programs. This approach will broaden our understanding of bilingual/bicultural training at many different levels and varieties.

10. The study should be publicized in ethnic newspapers. This can be done with the aid of on-site principal investigators. The project staff would assume responsibility for preparing the draft. Questions from community people can be directed to the on-site investigator, or if necessary, directly to the contract officers.

GPO 867-100